

modern language notes

Desk

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

VOL. LXXII, NO. 2, FEBRUARY 1957

RECEIVED
LIBRARY
JAN 24 1957
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

- 81 The Literary Background of Lydgate's *The Legend of Dan Joos*.
BEVERLY BOYD
- 87 The Wife of Bath and the Shipman. WILLIAM W. LAWRENCE
- 89 The Age of Troilus. JOHN M. STEADMAN
- 91 "... Who Only Stand and Wait": Milton's Sonnet "On his
Blindness." J. L. JACKSON and W. E. WEESE
- 93 Two Problems in Donne's "Farewell to Love." K. T. EMERSON
- 96 Pope and Miss Betty Marriot. R. N. MAUD
- 98 Conrad: A Nautical Image. R. O. EVANS
- 99 Masfield's *Dauber*: Autobiography or Sailor's Tale Retold?
F. B. DREW
- 101 Emily Dickinson's Boanerges and Thoreau's Atropos: Loco-
motives on the Same Line? NATHALIA WRIGHT
- 103 A Note on Henry James's First Short Story. R. L. GALE
- 107 Notes on the Origin of Some Gothic Inflectional Endings.
J. W. MARCHAND
- 111 *Roland 602 (O: Puis si cumencet a venir ses tresors)*.
GEOFFREY MELLOR
- 113 Rimbaud: The Doctors' Dilemma. F. C. ST. AUBYN
- 121 A Note on Lope de Vega's "Soneto de Repente." H. A. RYAN
- 124 *Situation* as a Term in Literary Criticism Again. LEO SPITZER
- 128 *A "Tassosplitter."* WALTER SILZ

REVIEWS

- 129 LEO HUGHES, *A Century of English Farce* (G. W. STONE, JR.)
- 130 WILLIAM HENRY IRVING, *The Providence of Wit in the English Letter Writers* (J. H. HAGSTRUM)
- 133 CHRISTINA KEITH, *The Russet Coat: a Critical Study of Butts' Poetry* (DEL. FERGUSON)
- 136 S. T. COLERIDGE, *Collected Letters, Vols. I, II* (EARL R. WASSERMAN)
- 137 H. C. DUFFIN, *Amphibian: A Reconsideration of Browning* (D. SMALLEY)
- 139 GEORGE ELLIOT, *Middlemarch*, ed. G. S. HAIGHT (J. BEATY)
- 141 JAMES BAIRD, *Ishmael* (ROY HARVEY PEARCE)
- 145 MARY REIFER, *Dictionary of New Words* (I. W. RUSSELL)
- 147 ROBERT A. HALL, JR., *Hands Off Pidgin English!* (THOMAS PYLES)
- 149 LEE M. HOLLANDER, II., *The Saga of the Jónsvíking* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 150 JÓHANN S. HANNESSON, *Bibliography of the Eddas* (STEFÁN EINARSSON)
- 151 FRIEDA N. POLITZER and ROBERT L. POLITZER, *Romance Trends in 7th and 8th Century Latin Documents* (ERNST PULGRAM)
- 154 WALTER NAUMANN, *Grillparzer. Das dichterische Werk* (F. E. COENEN)
- 158 CLAUDE DAVID, *Stefan George. Son oeuvre poétique* (W. H. MCCLAIN)

modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,
General Editor
DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
CLIFTON C. CHERPACK
STEFÁN EINARSSON
RICHARD H. GREEN
THOMAS R. HART, JR.
ANNA G. HATCHER
WILLIAM H. MCCLAIN
J. HILLIS MILLER
GEORGES POULET
KARL L. SELIG
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.50 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md. Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress of July 16, 1964.

(son)

atary

through
; \$6.2
; \$1.0
should
8, Mo
scribe
s, Th
Ever
return
ers an
e, Md
ate of
ingres

m
La
m

The
Lyo

D
Lyd
to ex
mira
them
Trin
Har
lecti
fasc
pres
prob
J

1 p
and
1 p
Libr
1 p
Tale
1 p
1930

VOL.

modern language notes

VOL. LXXII, NO. 2, FEBRUARY 1957

The Literary Background of Lydgate's *The Legend of Dan Joos*¹

Despite its imitative quality, *The Legend of Dan Joos* is one of Lydgate's most readable poems. Its editors have nevertheless failed to explore its literary background. This story, which is Lydgate's only miracle of the Virgin, has come down to us in three texts. Two of them, in the same handwriting, may be found in MS. R.3.21 of Trinity College, Cambridge.² The third text may be found in MS. Harley 2,251 of the British Museum.³ These manuscripts are collections of miscellaneous poems, apparently copied in the form of fascicules intended for separate use and later bound together in their present form. Both were copied at some time between 1442 and 1483, probably by John Shirley and his associates.⁴

John Bale, who was the first to set up a canon of Lydgate's works

¹ I should like to express my indebtedness to Professors Roger S. Loomis and E. V. K. Dobbie, of Columbia University, for their suggestions.

² Described by Montague Rhodes James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1901, II, 83-95.

³ Described by J. M. Manly and Edith Rickert, *The Text of the Canterbury Tales*, Chicago, 1940, I, 241-244.

⁴ Eleanor Prescott Hammond, "A Scribe of Chaucer," *MP*, XXVII (1929-1930), 27.

(1548), did not include *The Legend of Dan Joos*.⁵ Not until Joseph Ritson's Lydgate canon of 1802 was this miracle of the Virgin listed among Lydgate's poems.⁶ Since that year, the poem has been edited for the Percy Society by James O. Halliwell (1840),⁷ for the Chaucer Society by Carl Horstmann (1888),⁸ and for the Early English Text Society by Henry N. MacCracken (1911).⁹ But none of these editors has given it a preface explaining in full its background as a miracle of the Virgin.

Lydgate mentions his source in the fifth stanza:

Vincencius, in hys *Speculatyf Historiall*,
Of thys sayde monke maketh full mensioun
Under the fourme, to yow as I reherse shall. . . . (29-31)

"Vincencius" is Vincent of Beauvais (c. 1190-1264), a Dominican priest and theologian, whose *Speculum Majus* is the greatest of the medieval encyclopedias. The *Speculum Majus* is divided into three parts, entitled *Speculum Naturale*, *Speculum Doctrinale*, and *Speculum Historiale*. A fourth part, of doubtful authenticity, which is found in some of the manuscripts of the *Speculum Majus*, is called *Speculum Morale*. The *Speculum Historiale* (c. 1247) is a history of the world in relation to salvation. It contains a collection of miracles of the Virgin, which, because the works of Vincent of Beauvais were widely read, was refurbished many times by later legend-writers. Among its contents is the story upon which Lydgate based *The Legend of Dan Joos*:

Quidam Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis Ecclesie olim a Curia Romana revertens in Abbatia Sancti Bertini que est apud Sanctum Andomarum (Saint-Omer) hospitatus est. Et die crastina ductus in capitulum sermonem edificationis cum fratribus habuit. Quo finito indicavit eis quod cum esset apud Beneventum audisset a quodam viro religioso qui de partibus Hierosolymitanis (Jerusalem) erat, quod in illa terra quinque psalmos incipientes a singulis litteris nominis Beate Marie in honorem et memoriam ipsius frequentari multi consueverant: scilicet, *Magnificat*, *Ad Dominum cum Tribularer*, *Retribue*, *In Convertendo*, *Ad Te Levavi*, singulos *Ave Maria* premitentes. Erat autem ibidem in Conventu Sancti Bertini quidam monachus Joscio nomine qui hoc

⁵ *Scriptorum illustrium Maioris Brytannie, quam nunc Angliam & Scotiam vocant: Catalogus*, Basle, 1557-1559, pp. 586-587.

⁶ *Bibliographia Poetica*, London, 1802, pp. 66-87.

⁷ *A Selection from the Minor Poems of Dan John Lydgate*, London, 1840, pp. 62-66.

⁸ F. J. Furnivall, Edmund Brock, and W. A. Clouston, eds., *Originals and Analogues of Some of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer Soc., 2nd Ser., Nos. 7, 10, 15, 20, 22, London, 1888, 266-288.

⁹ *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, EETS, Ext. Ser., No. 107, London, 1911, pp. 311-315.

vigila
Beate
fratril
Suppr
cuius
accu
que fl
duo d
facie
ore ex
dies d
Episc
magn

It is
his e
Saint
versio
(1223
pious
gener

It
Altho
mirac
tales
order
nesse
matte
Beau
of th
near
books
an off

Di
There
demon
Virgi

10 V
Descri
Secon
11 H
242.
12 A
350-36

VOL. L

vigilanter audit et quotidie post matutinas predictos psalmos in honore Beate Marie decantare cepit. Accidit igitur ut quadam nocte surgentibus fratribus ad vigiliis ille Frater Joscio non inter esset choro psallentium. Supprior vero chorum circuens cum lucerna ubi eum non invenit ad lectum cuius eius perrexit, ibique eum defunctum repperit. Convocati autem fratres accurrunt stupentes et lugentes vultumque ei discooperientes invenerunt quinque flores rosarum. Unus egrediebatur de ore et lingua eius, duo de oculis, duo de auribus. Letantes pro tali miraculo detulerunt eum in chorum et facie discooperta cum recentibus rosis diligenter intuentes in rosa que de ore exibat invenerunt scriptum MARIA. Tenuerunt ergo illum per septem dies donec tres episcopi convenirent quorum unus fuit Attrebacensis (Arras) Episcopus, qui fuit abbas Cisterciensis, et multi alii clerici et laici qui viderunt magnalia Dei.¹⁰

It is interesting to note that an Abbot Joscio, afterwards beatified for his exemplary devotion to the Blessed Virgin, died at the Abbey of Saint-Bertin in 1163.¹¹ Since Gautier de Coincy includes a simpler version of the legend in his collection of miracles of the Virgin (1223),¹² it is possible that a popular legend attached itself to the pious Benedictine of Saint-Bertin, and in this form passed into general circulation.

It is not certain where Vincent of Beauvais found this legend. Although he was a Dominican, nothing is so characteristic of the miracles of the Virgin in the *Speculum Historiale* as the number of tales to which some twist is given to connect them with the Cistercian order. In the legend under discussion, for example, one of the witnesses is described as a former Cistercian abbot. This interesting matter may have something to do with the fact that Vincent of Beauvais, although a Dominican, held the post of lector, or professor of theology for the monks, in the Cistercian abbey of Royaumont, near Paris. At Royaumont, he would have had access to Cistercian books, and we know that the collecting of miracles of the Virgin was an official project among the Cistercians.

Did Vincent of Beauvais find our legend in a Cistercian book? There is reason to think that he did, for Evelyn Faye Wilson has demonstrated that the first part of the collection of miracles of the Virgin in the *Speculum Historiale* was taken from the lost *Mariale*

¹⁰ Venice, 1494, p. 84, now in the possession of the Harvard College Library. Described by Margaret Bingham Stillwell, *Incunabula in American Libraries, Second Census*, New York, 1940, p. 516.

¹¹ H. de Laplane, *Les abbés de Saint-Bertin*, Paris, 1854-1856, I, 221, 355; II, 242.

¹² Alexandre Poquet, ed. *Les miracles de la sainte Vierge*, Paris, 1857, pp. 359-361.

Magnum, a collection of miracles of the Virgin made by the Cistercians at some time between 1187 and 1247.¹³ Unfortunately, there is no conclusive evidence to identify the source of the second part of Vincent's collection of miracles of the Virgin, and it is to this second part that our legend belongs. Nevertheless, Professor Wilson has managed to point to at least one possibility, a second lost Cistercian collection, to which she has given the name "*Clairvaux Mariale*."¹⁴ If the "*Clairvaux Mariale*" should prove to be the source of the second part of the collection of miracles of the Virgin in the *Speculum Historiale*, Vincent de Beauvais did indeed find our legend in a Cistercian book.

As for the legend itself, it belongs to a cycle of miracles of the Virgin in which flower, or some other phenomenon, appears in the mouth of one who has practiced extraordinary devotion to the Blessed Virgin. This cycle consists of four tales and their variations, which may be called, from their best-known instances in literature, *The Monk and the Rose-Wreath*, *The Clerk of Chartres*, *The Legend of Dan Joos*, and *The Prioress's Tale*:

I. *The Monk and the Rose-Wreath*:

A. Cod. lat. 18134, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (fol. 145b); thirteenth century.

A rich widow used to pray to the Blessed Virgin while her son made garlands with which to crown the statue and to decorate their private chapel. When the mother died, the youth became a Cistercian. Unable any longer to spend his time weaving garlands, he recited an *Ave Maria* for each flower he had formerly put into the Blessed Virgin's garland.

One day, the young monk was sent out on business with a sum of money. As he rode along, he recited his *Ave Marias*. Two thieves, who were following him, suddenly beheld a beautiful maiden riding at his side upon a white mule. Each *Ave* turned into a rose, which the maiden took from his lips and wove into a garland. The thieves were so overcome by this miracle that they fell at the monk's feet in repentence.¹⁵

B. Cod. lat. 5927, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (fol. 195); early fourteenth century.

The cellarer of a Cistercian abbey used to recite fifty *Ave Marias* every day. It happened once that he was sent out on business with some money. A notorious brigand, who was lying in wait for him, saw him dismount and kneel to say his *Ave Marias*. Suddenly, a maiden appeared, carrying a golden hoop. She

¹³ *The Stella Maris of John of Garland*, Cambridge, Mass., 1946, pp. 36-37.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 42-44.

¹⁵ Joseph Dobner, *Die mittelhochdeutsche Versnovelle Marien Rosenkranz*, Borna-Leipzig, 1928, pp. 60-64. The summary is mine.

gathered roses that fell from his lips at each *Ave* and wove them into a garland. The brigand was converted at once.¹⁶

C. MS. Egerton 117, British Museum (fol. 174); fourteenth century.

A Cistercian used to recite one hundred and fifty *Ave Marias* each day. One day, he rode through a forest with a sum of money, saying his *Ave Marias* along the way. Some thieves, about to kill him, were restrained by the sight of some white doves that descended from heaven and gathered the roses that fell from his lips at each *Ave*. The thieves repented of their wickedness.¹⁷

II. *The Clerk of Chartres:*

A. MS. 12593, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (fol. 121b); thirteenth century.

A clerk of evil life in the city of Chartres, accustomed to pray to the Blessed Virgin very frequently, was killed by his enemies and buried outside a cemetery. Thirty days later, the Blessed Virgin appeared to one of the clerks, asking why her "chancellor" had been treated thus, and ordering him to see that the clerk be given decent burial. When the grave was opened, a flower was found in the clerk's mouth, and his tongue was seen to be preserved from corruption.¹⁸

B. Gautier de Coincy (1223).

A clerk fell into sin at the beginning of his career. An abbot, who was his uncle, advised him to pray to the Blessed Virgin. He did so, although he protested that he preferred Roland and Oliver to prayers. In time, his sins led to a violent death, and he was denied Christian burial. This offended the Blessed Virgin, who ordered the clergy to move the body to a cemetery. When they prepared to do so, they found a rose growing from the mouth of the dead clerk, and the tongue miraculously preserved from corruption.¹⁹

C. MS. 185, Vendome Public Library, France (No. 61); thirteenth century.

A clerk died during an interdict. He was buried in a field. When the interdict was removed, and funeral services were held for those who had died during the interdict, the clerk was forgotten. Some passers-by later discovered a flower, inscribed with the words *Ave Maria*, growing in the field. They dug it up, and thereby discovered the body of the clerk, whose tongue was miraculously preserved from corruption.²⁰

III. *The Legend of Dan Joos.*

IV. *The Prioress's Tale:*

A. Chaucer.

A little boy learned to sing the *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, and sang it while passing through the Jewry. The Jews cut his throat and threw his body into a privy. When his mother looked for him, she heard his voice singing *Alma*

¹⁶ *Loc cit.* The summary is mine.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 66. The summary is mine.

¹⁸ Wilson, *op. cit.*, 178. The summary is mine.

¹⁹ Poquet, *op. cit.*, 363-370. The summary is mine.

²⁰ Carleton Brown, *A Study of the Miracle of Our Lady Told by Chaucer's Prioress*, Chaucer Soc., 2nd Ser., No. 45, London, 1910, pp. 104-105. The summary is mine.

Redemptoris Mater. The body was recovered, and still the singing continued. The child explained that the Blessed Virgin had placed a "greyn" upon his tongue, and that he must sing until it should be removed. The bishop removed the "greyn" and the singing stopped.²¹

B. MS. Vernon, Bodleian Library, Oxford (fol. 124b); c. 1385.

A poor boy used to earn his living by singing the *Alma Redemptoris Mater*. This angered the Jews, so one of them cut his throat and threw his body into a privy. When the child continued to sing, the sound of his voice brought his mother and the city officials to the scene. The bishop found in the boy's throat a lily, bearing the words *Alma Redemptoris Mater*. When the lily was removed, the singing stopped. Then, at the funeral, the child sat up and began to sing *Salve, Sancta Parens*.²²

C. MS. 0.9.38, Trinity College, Cambridge (fol. 37); late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

A schoolboy in Toledo learned the *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, which he sang while passing a Jewry. The Jews seized him, cut his throat, tore out his heart, and threw his body into a privy. But the Blessed Virgin placed a white stone in his mouth, which caused him to sing again. At the end of his funeral, he was restored to life. The pebble was taken from his mouth and kept as a relic.²³

Needless to say, these summaries represent only a selection of the many legends which deal with these themes.

The Legend of Dan Joos is thus seen to be closely related in theme to *The Prioress's Tale*. Although he did not mention *The Monk and the Rose-Wreath*, Carleton Brown was aware of the relationship of these legends. What he was seeking, of course, was some explanation of the mysterious "greyn" which the Blessed Virgin placed upon the tongue of the little boy in *The Prioress's Tale*. I am not prepared to add to the many suggestions already offered about the nature of the "greyn," but I do think, with Professor Brown, that these legends contain some indication of the proper explanation, or perhaps even constitute the source, of the "greyn" incident in *The Prioress's Tale*.²⁴

With this information in mind, it is easily seen that the relation of *The Legend of Dan Joos* and *The Prioress's Tale* is more intrinsic than mere resemblance of style. There is good reason to think with Carl Horstmann that Lydgate deliberately set out to write a miracle

²¹ F. N. Robinson, ed. *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Cambridge, Mass., 1935, pp. 194-197. The summary is mine.

²² Carl Horstmann, ed. *The Minor Poems of the Vernon MS.*, Part I, EETS, Orig. Ser., No. 98, London, 1892, 141-145. The summary is mine.

²³ Brown, *op. cit.*, 44-50. The summary is mine.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 99-107.

of the Virgin to match Chaucer's.²⁵ Not only do the two poems treat legends which belong to the same cycle of miracles of the Virgin: they are both written in rime royal, which Chaucer is said to have invented. *The Legend of Dan Joos* does not possess the emotional appeal of *The Prioress's Tale*. It forms, however, an interesting part of a literary genre of which Chaucer's miracle of the Virgin is the outstanding example in English.

The University of Texas

BEVERLY BOYD

The Wife of Bath and the Shipman

In an article entitled "The *Shipman's Tale* Was Meant for the Shipman," Mr. R. L. Chapman takes issue with Professor F. N. Robinson's statement: "It is clear from ll. 12-19 that the *Shipman's Tale* was written for a woman, presumably for the Wife of Bath."¹ Since I am mentioned among others by Mr. Chapman as concurring in "the traditional judgment," I will state briefly why I think he is mistaken in his view of this tale.

His theory is as follows. "We know from the General Prologue that the shipman is a good fellow, that is, an excellent companion on the way. It is likely that he can tell an entertaining story with some flair, even with touches of mimicry." Lines 5-10 represent "a husbandly point of view" on wedlock; 12-19 "a wifely point of view." The Shipman must be thought of as speaking the former group "in a rueful basso," the latter "in a piping falsetto," imitating a man and a woman respectively. Consequently there is no reason to doubt that the Shipman was the original teller of the tale. Mr. Chapman's argument should of course be read in full.

If we could accept this interpretation, it would be important. In that case, a precious glimpse into Chaucer's procedure in matching tellers and tales would have to be sacrificed. But "a good felawe" (A 395) does not mean "an excellent companion on the way," but as Manly pointed out in his note to A 648 (649) ff., "good felawe was slang for 'a disreputable fellow,' 'a rascal.'"² A 395 is, as

²⁵ Furnivall, Brock, and Clouston, *op. cit.*, 278.

¹ F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston and New York, 1933), p. 837; Robert L. Chapman, *MLN*, LXXI (1956), 4-5.

² John Matthews Manly, *Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer* (New York, 1928), 534.

Manly indicated by a colon, and with a reference ahead to the note just quoted, explained in the lines immediately following; the Shipman was a thief. In Chaucer the phrase suggests a bad connotation. The Summoner would, for a quart of wine, let "a good felawe" have his concubine, and teach "a good felawe" anywhere not to fear the archdeacon's punishment. (A 648 ff.) The Wife of Bath could not resist sinning with "a good felawe" (D 617 f.); the gay yeoman in the *Friar's Tale* gives a greeting to "every good felawe," as may be expected of a devil in disguise. (D 1385)

Furthermore, the passage at the beginning of the *Shipman's Tale* which Mr. Chapman thinks is uttered by a burgher ("wo is hym that payen moot for al!") is entirely in keeping with what the Wife of Bath tells us about herself in her prologue—a tartar in her dealings with her husbands. ("O Lord! the peyne I dide hem and the wo!" D 384) Again, if Chaucer had intended to represent by a change of voice a male and a female speaker, we should expect some definite evidence of this in the text. What has not been clear to most modern critics, with their sharp eyes, is not likely to have been clear to Chaucer's contemporaries.

It is odd to hear that "unless Chaucer altered his idea of Alison entirely during the development of the *Canterbury Tales*, the *Shipman's Tale* is quite specifically inappropriate to her." Does a story setting forth the triumph of a wife in appeasing her husband by a clever reply show a "male bias"? Of course the wife in the story is no paragon of virtue, but neither is the Wife of Bath, whose convictions are not much to the credit of woman. In deciding whether the Shipman's narrative would have been appropriate for Dame Alison to tell, the basis of our judgment must be her characteristics as set forth in her prologue and in other passages in the *Tales*, rather than what we find in general in the fabliaux. Much more might be said as to the neatness with which the *Shipman's Tale* fits her. Kittredge wrote, "It accords with her character both in style and in sentiment. . . . And there are many expressions in the story which were clearly written for her and for her alone."³

We are, then, I think, quite justified in concluding that the *Shipman's Tale* may first have been assigned to the Wife of Bath.

Portland, Maine

WILLIAM W. LAWRENCE

³ George Lyman Kittredge, *Chaucer and his Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1915), p. 170.

The Age of Troilus

Neither Chaucer nor Boccaccio attempts to specify Troilus' age. Though both obviously regard him as youthful, their accounts of his ill-starred love-affair with Criseyde leave his precise years indefinite.

Nevertheless there are at least two reasons for regarding him as extremely young, even in Chaucer's and Boccaccio's versions of the story. In the first place, both poets conclude with an appeal to young people, who have reached the age for love, to profit by Troilus' example.¹ In Chaucer's poem, moreover, Troilus' passion for Criseyde apparently constitutes his first amour;² Boccaccio's Troilo, on the other hand, is more experienced.³

In the second place, earlier writers place considerable stress on Troilus' youth. Virgil describes him as "infelix puer."⁴ Dares Phrygius represents him as "minimus natus, non minus fortis quam Hector"⁵ and as valorous for his years ("pro aetate valentem").⁶ In Dictys Cretensis' narrative the Trojans lament Troilus' death, "recordati aetatem ejus admodum immaturam: qui in primis pueritiae annis, cum verecundia ac probitate, tum praecipue forma corporis amabilis, atque acceptus popularibus adolescebat."⁷ Joseph of Exeter

¹ *Il Filostrato*, VIII, Stanza 29:

"O giovanetti, ne' quai col' etate
Surgendo vien l'amoroso disio. . ."

Cf. *Troilus and Criseyde*, V, Stanza 263:

"O yonge fresshe folkes, he or she,
In which that love up groweth with your age. . ."

² I, Stanza 29:

"I have herd told, pardieux, of youre lyvyng,
Ye lovers, and youre lewed observaunces,
And which a labour folk han in wynnyng
Of love, and in the kepyng which doutances. . ."

³ I, Stanza 23:

"Io provai già per la mia gran follia
Qual fosse questo maladetto fuoco.
E s' io dicessi che amor cortesia
Non me facesse, ed allegrezza e giuoco
Non me donasse, certo i' mentiria,
Ma tutto il bene insieme accolto, poco
Fu o niente, rispetto a' martirj,
Volendo amare, ed a' tristi sospiri."

Troilo speaks with the voice of personal experience, Troilus from hearsay.

⁴ *Aeneid*, I, 475.

⁵ A. J. Valpy (ed.), *Dictys Cretensis et Dares Phrygius de bello Trojano* . . .
Accedunt Josephi Iscani de bello Trojano libri sex, I (Londini, 1825), p. 303.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 309.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

refers to him as "Mente Gigas, aetate puer, nullique secundus/Audendo virtutis opus. . ."⁸

A Vatican codex, ascribed to the tenth or eleventh century, regards him as under twenty at the time of his death.⁹ In a chapter entitled *De Troili casu* the anonymous "Mythographus Vaticanus Primus" describes Troilus' end and adds:

Cui dictum erat, quod si ad annos XX. pervenisset, Troia everti non potuisset.¹⁰

Although the possibility that Boccaccio and Chaucer may have been acquainted with the work of "Mythographus Primus" may be remote, it is not altogether out of the question. Raschke¹¹ believed this treatise to have influenced the "Mythographus Vaticanus Tertius," variously identified as Leontius,¹² Albricus,¹³ and Neckham.¹⁴ Both poets, furthermore, may have known Servius' reference to the oracle linking Troilus' destiny with that of Troy:

*Fatisque repulsi: oraculis . . . Secundum Plautum tribus; vita scilicet Troili, Palladii conservatione, integro sepulchro Laomedontis, quod in Scaea porta fuit: ut in Bacchidibus (4, 9, 29.) lectum est. Secundum alios vero, pluribus: ut de Aeaci genti aliquis interesset. Unde Pyrrhus admodum puer evocatus ad bellum est; . . . ut Rhesi equi tollerentur [a Graecis]: ut Herculis interesset sagittae: quas misit Philoctetes. . ."*¹⁵

In Chaucer's narrative (V, Stanza 2) three years elapse between the beginning of Troilus' passion for Criseyde and her departure from Troy. According to the tradition recorded by "Mythographus Primus" Troilus must have perished before reaching his twentieth year. Although the chances that Chaucer may have had this tradition in mind seem slight, one should not altogether discount the possibility that the young warrior enamoured of Criseyde at the feast of the Palladium may be a youth under seventeen.

Oxford, England

JOHN M. STEADMAN

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 468.

⁹ Angelus Maius (ed.), *Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum Tomus III* (Rome, 1831), p. v.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹¹ Robertus Raschke, *De Alberico mythologo* (Vratislaviae, 1912), p. 8.

¹² Maius, *op. cit.*, p. xii.

¹³ Raschke, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

¹⁴ Jean Seznec, *La survivance des Dieux Antiques* (London, 1940), p. 148.

¹⁵ Servius, *Commentarii in Virgilium*, ed. H. Albertus Lion (Gottingae, 1826), I, p. 116. Cf. *Aeneid*, II, 13. See Plautus, *Bacchides*, 953-5:

"Ilio tria fuisse audiui fata quae illi forent exitio:
signum ex arce si periisset; alterum etiamst Troili mors:
tertium, cum portae Phrygiae limen superum scinderetur. . ."

Bacchides was one of the "twelve last plays" of Plautus, which were still unrecovered during Chaucer's and Boccaccio's lifetimes.

“... Who Only Stand and Wait”:
Milton's Sonnet “On His Blindness”

There have been two standard explanations, both quite reasonable, for the last line of Milton's sonnet “On His Blindness”:

... Thousands at his bidding speed	12
And post o'er land and ocean without rest;	
They also serve who only stand and wait.	14

One explanation is that Milton meant that the duty of a good man of this world is to wait patiently for God's directions; as J. S. Smart put it, the last line may refer to “. . . devout men upon earth who approve themselves in the sight of God only by the humble and submissive acceptance of His decrees.”¹ The other explanation interprets “they” of the last line as angels and states that their duty is worshipful contemplation; thus Maynard Mack glosses the last line: “The highest order of angels were those who served God in contemplation.”²

Both of those explanations imply a passive, contemplative waiting, a kind of non-active attendance on God, in contrast to the intense activity of God's angels described in lines 12-13. But these explanations have never seemed quite satisfactory to many readers; they seem to indicate a passive existence, for man and for Milton, which hardly squares with the intense and fruitful life Milton led both before and after his blindness. The last line of the sonnet need not be taken to imply resignation, even temporary resignation, to a passive and contemplative existence in blindness. Rather, Milton probably expected his reader, who would naturally know his Bible well, to hear echoing from the word “stand” of the sonnet's last line the sixth chapter of *Ephesians* which tells the good Christian how to prepare himself for life:

Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to *stand* against the wiles of the devil.

For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of darkness, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to *withstand* in the evil day, and having done all, to *stand*.

¹ *The Sonnets of Milton* (Glasgow, 1921), p. 109.

² *Milton*. (Prentice-Hall, 1950), p. 75.

Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; . . .

Surely merely acquiring and embracing these qualities is a considerable and active endeavor.

When so armored, the Christian is prepared to "quench the fiery darts of the wicked" (6: 16) and to "withstand in the evil day." The repetitions of "stand" in the passage from *Ephesians*, which we have underlined, imply a more sturdy preparation and a more vigilant and dynamic action than mere waiting. This kind of "standing" is that described in the O. E. D. as "To take up an offensive or defensive position against an enemy; to await an onset." In sum, the duty of a good Christian, as St. Paul describes it, is to arm himself with the Christian virtues and then stand vigilant guard, prepared to defend himself against the onsets of evil. These actions may well have been the basis of the advice Milton gives us and himself in the sonnet's last line.

A surprising number of other parallels in this chapter of *Ephesians*, coming both before and after the passage organized around the word "stand," strongly suggest the blind Milton and his resolve to write a great Christian work.³ The parallels have been underlined in the four verses quoted below:

5. *Servants*, be obedient to them that are your masters. . . .

6. *Not with eyeservice*, as *menpleasers*; but as the servants of Christ, *doing the will of God from the heart*;

The word "servants" in verse 5 may well be a link with Milton's sonnet since the parable of the talents and the three servants occurs early in the sonnet.

19. *And for me, that utterance may be given to me*, that I may open my mouth boldly, *to make known the mystery of the gospel*.

20. *For which I am an ambassador in bonds*: that *therein I may speak boldly*, as I ought to speak.

There is a strong temptation to parallel the sentence "that I may . . . make known the mystery of the gospel" (verse 19) and Milton's stated purpose in *Paradise Lost* "to justify God's ways to men" (I, 26). There seems little doubt that Milton would be familiar with this important chapter of *Ephesians*, as he was with all the Bible; he quotes from it four times in the *De Doctrina Christiana*.⁴

³ James Holly Hanford, *A Milton Handbook* (Crofts, 1939), pp. 177-190.

⁴ We know of course that Milton was familiar with the wording of the King

The central image of the passage, to arm oneself in the armor of God, may well have been the main Biblical echo which Milton intended the last line of his sonnet to have, and many of the phrases surrounding the central passage are strikingly suggestive of Milton's own situation and mental state in 1652-1654 when the sonnet was written. The duty of a good man, and of Milton, as described by him in the last line of the sonnet, would seem to be an energetic, constant preparation of himself to resist the onset of evil and to deserve God's call to duty. Milton probably did not intend to suggest merely a passive and contemplative waiting for God's instructions.

USAF Academy
Denver, Colorado

LT. COL. JAMES L. JACKSON
CAPT. WALTER E. WEESE

Two Problems in Donne's "Farewell to Love"

Lines 28-30 of Donne's "Farewell to Love" have been called by John Hayward "the most unintelligible in the whole canon of Donne's poetry."¹ They have received perhaps more than their share of attention but up to now have defied satisfactory interpretation. Part of the problem lies in the fact that the poem exists in only two manuscripts, which, according to Miss Helen Gardner,² are unreliable and too closely related to serve as checks on the accuracy of one another. The first printing of the poem, in 1635, seems to be derived from one of these, the O'Flaherty Manuscript, and therefore offers no additional help.

Donne conjectures that Nature may have attached the curse of subsequent boredom to the sex act in order to restrain man from life-consuming overindulgence,

Because that other curse of being short,

And onely for a minute made to be

Eager, desires to raise posteritie.

(1635 text)

James' version, and used the English wording of the 1611 version of *Judges* in *Samson Agonistes*. See *Complete Poetical Works of Milton*, ed. Fletcher (Houghton Mifflin, 1941), p. 437.

¹ In the Nonesuch edition of Donne's *Complete Poetry and Selected Prose* (Bloomsbury, 1929), p. 192.

² *TLS*, June 10, 1949, p. 381.

The earlier reference, in line 16, to the acute brevity of sexual pleasure ("being had, enjoying it decays"), seems to indicate fairly clearly that this is the curse referred to, rather than the curse of man's mortality, as Sir Herbert Grierson has suggested in his edition of Donne's poetry (London, 1912).

Miss Gardner suggests that "made" be considered as a finite verb in the past tense, having "curse" as its subject and "desires" as its object. This interpretation renders the passage intelligible virtually as it stands in the manuscripts but makes it seem unduly awkward. Her reading gives the lines the same meaning, except for tense, as Grierson's emendation, which is:

Because that other curse of being short,
And only for a minute made to be,
(Eagers desire) to raise posterity.

But an unsolved problem remains: how is the phrase "to raise posterity" to be taken? For Grierson it has a literal meaning: by begetting posterity man attempts to circumvent his curse of mortality. Miss Gardner also takes it literally. George Williamson³ and J. C. Maxwell⁴ feel that Donne had no such serious thoughts as man's posterity in mind during the composition of the poem, and argue that it is the posterity of the act itself, with its attendant curse, which is to be raised through repetition. Both of these interpretations leave something to be desired, the first because it is inharmonious with the carefree mood and amatory subject of the poem, the second because it is probably somewhat farther fetched than we can expect from even Donne's poetry and is, as Miss Gardner has noted, inappropriate in a poem in which Donne is concerned with the process by which actual—not figurative—posterity may be raised.

A more straightforward interpretation of the passage seems to be that the brevity of the sex act urges man, in his quest for satisfaction, to repeat the act: it sharpens his desire "to raise posterity"—which phrase can most happily be read as Donne's cynical euphemism for "to engage in sexual intercourse." The phrase derives sardonic humor from the fact that man as discussed in this poem is not at all concerned with raising posterity, but rather with the "sport" (l. 27) by which this is accomplished. Thus the phrase is wholly appropriate to the mood and subject of the poem, which is a cynical discussion of sexual love.

³ *MP*, xxxvi (1939), 301-303.

⁴ *TLS*, May 6, 1949, p. 297.

In the concluding stanza, which immediately follows these lines, Donne makes plans for avoiding contact with any ladies whose beauties might move him once again to pursue love. It concludes:

If all faile,
'Tis but applying worme-seed to the Taile. (ll. 39-40)

Hayward's note on these lines is: "Wormseed . . . is a powerful anaphrodisiac. The Latin word for tail is *penis*, and tail in this sense is common in Elizabethan literature." On the strength of this note, the lines have been taken to mean that if all else fails, one can always resort to anaphrodisiacs. This interpretation has been accepted without dissent.⁵ But the grammar of the sentence does not lend itself readily to this interpretation. In order to have this meaning, surely the lines would require the addition of some phrase such as "a matter of" after "but." Without such a phrase there is, in the interpretation based on Hayward's note, no antecedent for the "it" contracted in "'Tis." What is "but applying worme-seed to the Taile"?

An interpretation consistent with the grammar of the sentence is that line 40 is a metaphor, with this sense: "If these expedients fail, what more could one expect? For they are, after all, directed only at avoiding the occasion rather than rooting out the cause of the difficulty. They are as purposeless as it would be to apply wormseed to the tail, since wormseed can be effective [either as an anthelmintic or as an anaphrodisiac—the sense of the metaphor is the same in either case] only when taken orally." In sort, the attempt to avoid beauty is a futile application of one's energies while a disposition to love remains. By this reading, "all" in line 39, representing all the plans which Donne has just proposed, is the antecedent of the "it" that is troublesome in the other interpretation. The present-tense "'Tis" is then normal for the situation. Thus the wormseed seems here to be a metaphor, rather than a possible last resort. However, the erotic connotations of the two key words enrich Donne's use of them in a way especially appropriate to the poem and typical of the poet's intricate imagery.

Lehigh University

KATHERINE T. EMERSON

⁵ Professor George Williamson, in *MP*, xxxvi, 303, recognizes the possibility that the lines may represent either "a metaphor of futility" or a "cynical last resort," though he appears to favor the latter.

Pope and Miss Betty Marriot

One of Pope's most delightful poems is his Coronation Epistle, the familiar verse letter included in the first edition of his works (1717) immediately after *To a Young Lady with the Works of Voiture* and entitled *To the Same, on her Leaving the Town after the Coronation*.¹ In *New Light on Pope* (London, 1949), Norman Ault concluded: "There can be no doubt whatever that the epistle was originally addressed to Teresa [Blount] in 1714" (p. 59). Without disputing this statement at all, we can suggest that Pope had more than Teresa in mind and that there is one particularly suitable candidate for the poem's "fond virgin"

whom her mother's care
Drags from the town to wholsom country air,
Just when she learns to roll a melting eye,
And hear a spark, yet think no danger nigh. (ll. 1-4)

After all, Teresa Blount was twenty-six at the time and might be assumed to have learnt to roll a melting eye some time before. Pope was two-faced enough to address a poem to one lady, while gaining much of his inspiration for the poem from another. Though the Coronation Epistle may have ended up at Mapledurham, there is no guarantee that it did not begin in the village of Sturston, Suffolk, with a certain Miss Betty Marriot, someone very young, still very much in her mother's care, and by whom Pope was undoubtedly captivated.

The playful, bantering tone of the Coronation Epistle is echoed exactly in Pope's letters to Mrs. and Miss Marriot, all of the period 1713-15. These letters, like the poem, are dominated by a town v. country theme; for instance, one to Mrs. Marriot, 19 July 1713:

You set before my Eyes the entertainments of Balls and Masquerades, Parties of Pleasure in Spring Gardens, Plays and Music meetings, Raffling Shops, and all those things which your fair daughter hates in her heart, & is so very glad to avoid in the shades of Suffolk.²

Here, in teasing irony, we have all that is summed up in line 32 of the Coronation Epistle: "You dream of triumphs [i.e. city pag-

¹ The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope (Vol. vi), *Minor Poems*, ed. Norman Ault and John Butt (London and New Haven, 1954), uses a title based on the 1735 printing: "Epistle To Miss Blount, on her leaving the Town, after the Coronation" (p. 124).

² *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. George Sherburn (Oxford, 1956), I, 181.

eants] in the rural shade." As for the poet's country competitor, the "Squire . . . you take delight to rack" (line 23), he is present in Pope's "warning" to Miss Betty against pastoral flirtation:

You have nothing to do but to write if you please, and possibly it may keep you from employing your self worse: it may save some honest neighbouring Gentleman from three or four of your pestilent glances. Cast your eyes upon Paper, Madam, there you may look innocently: Men are seducing, books are dangerous, the amorous one's soften you, and the godly one's give you the spleen: If you look upon trees, they clasp in embraces; birds and beasts make love; the Sun is too warm for your blood, the Moon melts you into yielding and melancholy. Therefore I say once more, cast your eyes upon Paper, and read only such Letters as I write. . . .³

The climax to this letter presents the most striking parallel to the verse epistle. Pope is contrasting his own longings with those of Miss Betty and puts into her mouth the sigh:

Oh Play-houses, Parks, Opera's, Assemblies, London!⁴

Line 13 of the Epistle is:

She went from Op'ra, park, assembly, play,

the same four items and no others. The letter ends with Pope's opposite rapture, for the countryside of woods, gardens, rookeries, fishponds, arbors, and Miss Betty! It is the situation of the Coronation Epistle.⁵

Harvard University

RALPH N. MAUD

³ *Correspondence*, I, 206, dated "1714[?]."

⁴ *Correspondence*, I, 206.

⁵ Whether or not the Marriots were in London for the Coronation itself (20 October 1714), there are definite hints in Pope's letters to Broome that they visited the city that winter:

Shall not Mrs. Betty shine this winter among the glories of the court and town? Shall foreigners and Germans engross the adorations of all men? Let her come and vindicate English beauty (London, 29 November 1714, *Correspondence*, I, 270-271).

You overjoy me in the news that Mrs. Betty Marriot will be in town. I hope she will give me leave to wait on her toilet sometimes (London, 10 February 1714/15, *Correspondence*, I, 276).

Conrad: A Nautical Image

Conrad's "rare virtuosity in the use of technical terms," as Cazamian recognized, is twice exemplified by his use of nautical images in the "Secret Sharer," both closely related to his symbolism. The first example occurs at the instant of Leggatt's crime, where the ship is described as a "deep ship." Unless sail is put up, the ship will yaw away from the wind and flounder. Leggatt is the instrument of salvation, but at the moment the balance of the universe is disturbed, and he commits a murder. In Conrad's eschatology heroic action does not make him less culpable.

More important and elucidating the first image is the nautical image at the climax of the story, where in order for the sea captain to allow Leggatt to slip overboard he must bring the *Sephora* dangerously close to the shore. The ship must then be turned into the wind where she will momentarily "hang in stays" until she falls off on one course or the other, one leading to success the other disaster. For an instant the breeze blows on both sides of the sail; the ship has lost its agent of propulsion and continues forward merely because of its momentum. As any sailor before the mast knows, the process entails a tricky balance, particularly in a gale or in a very light air. At the beginning of the story, when Leggatt performed his heroic action, the balance was disturbed by a gale; at the climax the breeze is barely perceptible. Both situations are charged with menace and, for the sailor, contain real tension and struggle, but the benevolence, on the surface, of the universe in the second case may seriously mislead the land-locked reader.

The captain puts the bow into the wind, while Leggatt slips over the side. The ship hovers in the balance, and there is real danger that it may be wrecked because the captain has come too close to shore for a second try. Symbolically the ship represents a microcosmos of social relations temporarily upset, in terms of normal ethics, by the captain's rescue of Leggatt. The captain's career hangs in the balance, "in stays" as it were, and the outcome depends neither on fate, as it might in Hardy, nor on experience but on skill and perhaps a little luck, both related symbolically to the captain's ethical vision. The captain's hat, which he has given Leggatt and which symbolically epitomizes his action towards Leggatt, floats on the water, a clear marker of the very instant at which it will be necessary to twist the helm to bring the ship about on a successful tack.

Thus the captain is not separated from his double until the final action of the story. Afterwards, his initiation completed, he has become free of Leggatt and is prepared to assume a new position in the world of affairs. Literally, for the first time, he is master of ship and crew, and there is nothing incongruous about his rejoicing: "I was alone with her. Nothing! No one in the world should stand between us, throwing a shadow on the way of silent knowledge and mute affection, the perfect communion of a seaman with his first command."¹

It is necessary, I believe, to understand the nautical images before it becomes clear, from the business about the hat, that the mechanism of the double is supposed to end at this point. Such a view supports Albert Guerard's contention that the captain is finally able to "see Leggatt as a separate and real human being."² Balance has been restored, and there is once again a future. Conrad can then end the story with the puzzling words about Leggatt, which apply as well to the captain: "A free man, a proud swimmer striking out for a new destiny."

University of Kentucky

ROBERT O. EVANS

Masefield's *Dauber*: Autobiography or Sailor's Tale Retold?

In writing about John Masefield's *Dauber*, critics, from Louise Townsend Nicholl in 1919 to Muriel Spark in 1953, have found in the character and experience of the hero a revelation of "the course of the poet's own life."¹ In 1953, answering a student's query about

¹ Carl Benson in his article, "Conrad's Two Stories of Initiation," *PMLA*, March 1954, pp. 46-56 objects to this statement as immature. As the story is concerned with other themes besides that of initiation, I cannot agree.

² Albert J. Guerard (ed.), *Heart of Darkness and the Secret Sharer* (Signet ed.; New York: Doubleday & Co., 1950), p. 12.

³ H. W. Nevinston, *John Masefield: An Appreciation*, London, Heinemann, 1931, p. 6. See also L. T. Nicholl, *John Masefield*, unpublished MS, 1919, II, 7; W. H. Hamilton, *John Masefield: A Popular Study*, rev. ed., N. Y., Macmillan, 1925, p. 136; Cecil Biggame, *John Masefield: A Study*, Cambridge, Heffner, 1924, pp. 21-22; Gilbert Thomas, *John Masefield*, N. Y., Macmillan, 1933, p. 166; L. A. G. Strong, *John Masefield*, London, Longmans Green, 1952, pp. 21-23; Muriel Spark, *John Masefield*, London, Nevill, 1953, p. 126.

autobiographical elements in the poem, Masfield wrote that the Dauber of his story was a young artist who wished to paint the sea and who was killed, as described in the poem, many years ago. The artist's death had been reported to the poet by an eye-witness and had happened somewhere in the South Pacific.²

Masfield has revealed the origin of the Dauber story more fully and explicitly in a short 1906 newspaper story called "In the Roost," which was never republished and which has been overlooked by the critics.³ In this first attempt at retelling the tale told him by the "eye-witness," Masfield sets the story in the framework of a day spent in a New York saloon yarnning with a sailor friend. The sailor tells the story of a young painter named Ash, whom the writer had known aboard the *Joppa*. Ash, only twenty, "a clever fellow" who "was going to be an artist . . . to paint ships," had shipped as dauber and gone "through twenty hells with a brute of a bosun . . . willing to go through twenty hells if he might paint ships when he came to the end." The writer's friend tells him of Ash's death on a second ship, where the painter had fallen from the fore upper topsail to the deck and died within half an hour, without speaking. "In the Roost" emphasizes the sailors' superstitious behavior after Ash's death, with some discussion of reincarnation and life after death. The ending of the story is light, as the two men abandon this serious topic to go to watch "the French eccentric in her gigantic paper-tearing act."

In 1912, six years after "In the Roost," Masfield wrote *Dauber*.⁴ The central character, a young painter who endures a hard life in order to gain the knowledge from which he may paint the sea, and the climactic incident of the fall that kills him, come directly from "In the Roost" or from the original eye-witness account. Around that character and that incident Masfield constructed his poem. Ash becomes "Dauber." In an interlude of the narrative, Dauber tells a shipmate of his childhood in England and his reason for coming to sea; "In the Roost" contains no hint of this background.

² Letter to J. D. Brasch, Buffalo, N. Y., from Abingdon, Feb. 2, 1953. Sparr records similarly, *op. cit.*, p. 126, that Masfield told her that the story was "a true one which he happened to hear about, and decided to put into verse." Yet on p. 135 she writes "One cannot help feeling that John Masfield's own experience is here depicted."

³ *Manchester Guardian*, Mar. 16, 1906, signed J. M. (authorship authenticated by *Manchester Guardian* in letter to Fraser Drew, Aug. 3, 1951).

⁴ Published in *English Review*, London, Oct. 1912; in *The Story of a Round-House and Other Poems*, N. Y., Macmillan, Nov. 1912; separately, London, Heinemann, May 1913.

In the poem, Dauber's attempts to paint, his hard life with an unsympathetic crew, and a great storm are described at length. Many details could have possibly been picked up from reading about the sea, but the fact that Masfield sailed around the Horn as a boy of sixteen in 1894, would obviate any need for him to depend upon secondary sources for his nautical material.

Dauber's death is carefully timed and staged; it is justified from the viewpoint of tragic necessity (for he has apparently abandoned his original purpose, or at least temporarily relegated it to the background in favor of becoming a sailor and a man in the eyes of the crew). In the poem, Dauber does not die without speaking but murmurs "It will go on." Masfield ends his second retelling of the story, in which, this time, the emphasis has been upon "the conflict of the artist in a Philistine country,"⁵ with a characteristic final scene in which peace and beauty contrast with the preceding violence.

It may be concluded that the germ of *Dauber* was a tale told to Masfield by the "eye-witness," and that the long narrative poem grew from this beginning through the intermediate form of the short story, "In the Roost." *Dauber* is not, then, basically autobiographical, although its theme and its descriptive detail are clearly Masfield's own.

State University of New York,
College for Teachers, Buffalo

FRASER BRAGG DREW

Emily Dickinson's Boanerges and Thoreau's Atropos: Locomotives on the Same Line?

In her poem about a train beginning "I like to see it lap the miles," Emily Dickinson employed a metaphor which had inevitably been a common one since the beginning of railroads: the locomotive as an iron horse. The images in the last stanza suggest, however, that she was inspired by a particular earlier treatment of the subject in which this metaphor was dominant, that by Thoreau in the chapter entitled "Sounds" in *Walden*.

⁵ Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

Nearly half this chapter is devoted to a description of the Fitchburg Railroad, whose tracks passed within a hundred rods of Thoreau's house by the pond. It is primarily an aural description; the escaping steam and the whistle of the locomotive, the vibration of the wheels, the shouts of the passengers, the commotion of transported livestock are heard, and onomatopoeic words like "hissing," "whizzing," "rumbling" occur. Figuratively it is a description constructed from the basic personification of the locomotive as a horse and from a cluster of images drawn from the air, the heavens, and mythology.

Emily Dickinson's poem, too, appeals chiefly to the sense of hearing, and her iron horse also is associated with what may be called a meteorological-mythological image and an astronomical one. Both trains traverse mountains and valleys and pass beside shanties (Thoreau's dwelling was built of boards from James Collins' "shanty"). Particularly notable is the fact that the image in the poem "prompter than [punctual as] a Star / Stop . . . at it's own stable door" is a combination of two locutions in the prose: "he will reach his stall only with the morning star" and "Have not men improved somewhat in punctuality since the railroad was invented?" But most remarkable of all, the poet's striking simile "neigh like Boarnerges" is a transformation of the essayist's "snort like thunder."

In the following passages¹ the italicized words indicate these imagistic similarities (the bracketed words being manuscript variants in the poem):

When I meet the engine with its train
of cars moving off with *planetary* motion,
— or, rather, like a *comet* . . . when I
hear the *iron horse* make the *hills* echo
with his *snort like thunder* . . . it seems
as if the earth had got a race now worthy
to inhabit it. . . .

I watch the passage of the morning
cars with the same feeling that I do the
rising of the *sun*, which is hardly more
regular. . . . The *stabler* of the *iron*
horse was up early this winter morning
by the light of the *stars* amid the *moun-*
tains, to *fodder* and harness his *steed*.
. . . If the snow lies deep, they strap
on his snowshoes, and, with the giant

I like to see [hear] it lap the
Miles —

And lick the Valleys up —
And stop to feed itself at Tanks —
And then — prodigious step

Around a Pile of *Mountains* —
And supercilious peer
In *Shanties* — by the sides [ribs]
of Roads —
And then a *Quarry* pare

To fit it's sides
And crawl between
Complaining all the while
In horrid — *hooting stanza* —

¹ H. D. Thoreau, *Walden* (New York: Rinehart & Co., c1948), pp. 95-97; Emily Dickinson, *Poems*, ed. by T. H. Johnson (Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1955), II, 447-448.

plow, plow a furrow from the mountains to the seaboard. . . . All day the fire-steed flies over the country, stopping only that his master may rest, and I am awakened by his tramp and defiant snort at midnight . . . in some remote glen in the woods . . . and he will reach his stall only with the morning star. . . . Or perchance, at evening, I hear him in his stable blowing off the superfluous energy of the day. . . .

They [the cars] do come with . . . regularity and precision. . . . Have not men improved somewhat in punctuality since the railroad was invented? . . . We have constructed a fate, an *Atropos* [Thoreau's italics], that never turns aside. (Let that be the name of your engine.)

External evidence that Emily Dickinson read *Walden* appears to be wanting, but it seems reasonable, especially in view of her interest in Transcendentalists, to suppose that she did. The manuscript of her poem has been tentatively dated 1862, which was the year of Thoreau's death.

The hermit aspects of the two authors' characters has often been compared. Their imaginations, however, ranged different realms and were fed on different lores. Even in these brief descriptions from their pens of the same noisy and fantastic object, it is significant that the poet's single allusion evokes the Bible and the essayist's New England sounds are so often echoes from Olympus.

University of Tennessee

NATHALIA WRIGHT

A Note on Henry James's First Short Story

Leon Edel has adduced external evidence that Henry James's first short story was "A Tragedy of Error"¹ and has supported this contention by showing that the anonymous tale is Jamesian in tech-

¹ *Continental Monthly*, V (February, 1864), 204-216. Page references to "A Tragedy of Error" will be made parenthetically in the text.

Then chase itself down *Hill* —

And [And, or then] neigh like
Boanerges —

Then — prompter than [punctual
as] a *Star*

Stop — docile and omnipotent
At its own stable door —

nique and plot elements.² Added proof may be found by comparing the figurative and near-figurative language in the story with that of James's later and known fiction. To begin, "A Tragedy of Error" is an 8,000-word story containing some twenty-eight similes, metaphors, imaginative analogies, and personifications. Thus, the imagistic density" of the tale is 3.5 figures per one thousand words. James's thirteen signed short stories published in the 1860's contain a total of 598 images in a total of 171,200 words, or also exactly 3.5 images per thousand words.³

Of more interest than statistics, however, is a consideration of kind and quality of imagery. Since "A Tragedy of Error" is very short, it is somewhat hazardous to assign its few specific figures to any of the main categories of James's imagery in order to compare and generalize; but it is pertinent to note that "A Tragedy of Error" has six water, four war, and two animal images. Though it was perhaps inevitable for the story to have water and war figures, since its action leads to a murder in a French harbor, still the fact becomes significant when we note that of the more than 16,000 figures in all of James's fiction, almost 3,000 fall into the categories of water, war, and animal.⁴

Before discussing particular images taken from "A Tragedy of Error," perhaps I should sketch its plot briefly. Hortense Bernier, losing the support of her lover, Louis de Meyrau, when she tells him that her husband Charles is returning home to H— (presumably Le Havre), hires the services of a murderous boatman to rid her of her husband; but through a mix-up Louis is drowned instead and the husband comes home after all. Ironically, the first image in this melodramatic tale uses the topic of death in the water. M. de Meyrau is callously telling the terrified Hortense that people, preoccupied as they are with their own sins, will not observe and discuss those of others: "'When a ship goes to pieces on those rocks out at sea, the poor devils who are pushing their way to land on a floating spar, don't bestow many glances on those who are battling with the waves beside them'" (p. 205). In the later fiction there are more than seventy images involving turbulent waters, endangered and smashed vessels, and floating wreckage. Here is one: Christina Light's mother in

² Henry James: 1843-1870: *The Untried Years* (Philadelphia and New York), pp. 215-217.

³ See my unpubl. diss. (Columbia, 1952), "The Caught Image: A Study of Figurative Language in the Fiction of Henry James," pp. 377-380.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

Roderick Hudson, clinging to what aid she can, "clutched Rowland by his two hands as if in the shipwreck of her hopes he were her single floating spar" (I, 396⁵). It is curious that the word *floating*, which is used in James's later works so often that it becomes almost a mannerism, should appear in his very first image.⁶

The other water image of interest in "A Tragedy of Error" stems from the literal pearls in the case of the watch which Mme. Bernier offers the boatman. He replies, "'The pearls in that watch are costly because it's worth a man's life to get at them. You want me to be your pearl diver. Be it so. You must guarantee me a safe descent . . .'" (p. 214). Though the pearl is normally employed differently in the later fiction, yet in *The Wings of the Dove* there is a similar usage. When Densher gives Kate Croy his unopened letter from the now dead Milly, to treat it as she will, the implusive girl flings it into the fire—Densher could guess at the contents, but the part "missed for ever was the turn" probably given to Milly's generosity, "the loss of which was like the sight of a priceless pearl cast before his eyes . . . into the fathomless sea" (XX, 396). Hortense Bernier in her ruthless determination resembles Kate, who now controls Milly's gift; moreover, Hortense offers her literal pearls to protect her illicit love for Meyrau, while Kate would have wished Densher to accept Milly's gift, figurative pearls included, to support their irregular though now doomed love.

One war image from "A Tragedy of Error" is of interest here. Meyrau tells his mistress that when gossiped about she should speak out rather than silently weep: "'That pocket handkerchief is always more or less of a flag of truce'" (p. 205). James later used many battle flags in imagery, and also a few flags of truce: in *The Portrait of a Lady* the Countess Gemini's "demonstrations suggested the violent waving of some flag of general truce—white silk with fluttering streamers" (III, 366).⁷

A few other passages from James's early, anonymous story display figurative and near-figurative language which is similar to that in the later, signed fiction. For instance, in "A Tragedy of Error" we

⁵ All quotations from James's signed fiction for which parenthetical volume and page references are provided are from *The Novels and Tales of Henry James: New York Edition*, 26 Volumes (New York, 1907-1917).

⁶ James often used the word *float* in senses no longer to be regarded as metaphorical; thus, "she was, as she said to herself, floated [launched, set going]" (III, 60); "he appeared but half capable of floating [sustaining] his generalisation to the end" (X, 161); etc.

⁷ See also New York Edition, xxiii, 348.

read that "a countenance is 'lit up' by a smile; and indeed that momentary flicker does the office of a candle in a dark room" (p. 209). In the later *Portrait of a Lady* Isabel's bleak life is similarly lit up, for "Ralph's little visit was a lamp in the darkness" (IV, 203); and the narrator of "Madame de Mauves" hopes to charm the titular heroine—"It was too inspiring not to act upon the idea of kindling a truer light in his fair country-woman's slow smile" (XIII, 223).⁸

James's novels and stories, including "A Tragedy of Error," are replete with diction just admissible as figurative. The word *plunge*, for example, is often so used. Thus, "Madame Bernier was plunged in a sidelong scrutiny of her ferryman's countenance" (p. 209), and, from the signed fiction, "she simply plunged . . . deeper into the company of Sir Claude" (XI, 342), etc.⁹ The following passage from "A Tragedy of Error" is likewise barely figurative: ". . . I have judged best, hitherto, often from an exaggerated fear of trenching on the ground of fiction, to tell you what this poor lady did and said, rather than what she thought" (p. 215); while in *The American* we find a somewhat similarly phrased statement: "there was not a symptom of apprehension he would trench on any ground she proposed to avoid" (II, 504).

In near-figurative diction too "A Tragedy of Error" resembles James's signed fiction. Mme. Bernier complains to her lover, "'Every tongue that greets him [her husband] . . . will wag to the tune of a certain person's misconduct'" (p. 205). Much later, we read in *The Ambassadors*: "To this tune . . . was his surrender made good" (XXII, 15), etc. In the anonymous story it is said that "other people are in the same box" (p. 205); later we read in *The Wings of the Dove* that "here doubtless were hundreds of others just in the same box" (XIX, 250). In the early story is this simple dead metaphor: "Hortense was a mute spectator of this little drama" (p. 208). In *The Ambassadors* the same simple cliché is repeated: "Strether had become aware of the little drama" (XXII, 151). In "A Tragedy of Error" occurs James's first usage of *elastic*, a once metaphorical word which is rather common in his works: "'Necessary is a very elastic word . . .'" (p. 209); later we read that "the situation was made elastic by the amount of explanation called into play" (XXII, 259), etc. The unnamed boatman's grimace is called "one of those

⁸ See also New York Edition, XI, 211; and *The Novels and Stories of Henry James: New and Complete Edition*, 35 volumes (London, 1921-1923), xxvi, 55.

⁹ See also New York Edition, XII, 210; xvi, 215.

conscious, cautious, dubious smiles, which may cover either a criminal assumption of more than the truth or a guilty repudiation of it" (p. 211). Later, the narrator of "Master Eustace," condoning Mrs. Garnyer's strangeness, says, "This secret sadness would have covered more sins than I ever had to forgive her."¹⁰ And in *The Golden Bowl* Charlotte picks an argument with Fanny and says, "'... it's least of all worthy of you to seem to wish to quarrel with me in order to cover your desertion'" (XXIII, 263). Each of the three uses of the word *cover* is slightly different, but all are typically Jamesian.

To conclude briefly, we should be ready to admit, from this consideration of one phase of diction—namely, that of figurative language and language almost so—that Henry James was indeed, as Leon Edel has been at pains to suggest, the author of the anonymous short story "A Tragedy of Error."

University of Mississippi

ROBERT L. GALE

Notes on the Origin of Some Gothic Inflectional Endings

First person plural preterite indicative. It is generally assumed that the *-um* ending of the first person plural of the preterite indicative in Gothic is not a direct continuation of the IE perfect ending **-me*. Indeed, if we compare Gothic *witum* to *Skt. vidmá* (IE **wid-mé*), for example, we are at a loss to explain the *-u-* of the Gothic ending. According to the usual statement of Auslautgesetz for Gothic, the IE final **-e* should have become lost, and the covered **-m-* should have remained, yielding a Gothic **witm*. Two theories have been proposed to account for the *-u-* in the Gothic ending. It is generally explained as deriving from analogy to the third person plural preterite indicative ending *-un*, itself not explained in a completely satisfactory manner.¹ Krahe has assumed that, after the loss of the final vowel in such an IE form as **wid-mé*, the final **-m* became **-m̥* after a consonant and then developed like inherited *m*.

¹⁰ London Edition, xxvi, 44.

¹ Cf. H. Hirt, *Handbuch des Urgermanischen*, II (Heidelberg, 1932), 141 f.; E. Kieckers, *Handbuch der vergleichenden gotischen Grammatik* (Munich, 1928), p. 196.

(i. e. became *-um*).² Such a process seems highly improbable, in view of such Gothic forms as *-bagm* (R 11, 24), *stikl* (J 18, 11), etc. The following explanation is suggested here: According to Sievers' law, the IE ending **-me* should appear under two forms, **-me* after a short syllable, **-ǣme* (**-mme*) after a long syllable.³ In the case of the verbs of the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th classes of the strong verb, as well as in the case of all weak verbs, the syllable immediately preceding the ending was long. Thus, there were two Proto-Germanic endings for the first person plural preterite indicative, **-mi* in the case of the first three classes of the strong verb, **-umi* in the case of the other verb classes. That the more often used of these two endings should have prevailed should not surprise us.

The dative singular of the o-stems. The Gothic dative singular of the *o*-stem nouns and adjectives (*-a*) is derived in most handbooks from an IE instrumental in **-ē*.⁴ The possibility has also been suggested that it derives from an IE locative singular ending **-ōi*.⁵ A comparison of Gothic *bairai*, third person singular optative present of *bairan*, with Skt. *bharēt* (IE *bheroīt*), where IE **-ōi* (it is well known that IE **-t* did not act as a covering consonant in Germanic) yields Gothic *-ai*, deprives this argument of any force. Kluge and Prokosch have pointed out the possibility that the Gothic dative may derive from the IE ablative of the *o*-stems, either from **-ēd* (Kluge cites *þe*, *he*, *hvamme-h* as examples of an IE ablative, rather than as instrumental, as is usually done) or from **-ōd*.⁶ The possibility that it derives from an IE dative ending **-ōi* is usually denied, and I know of no scholar who maintains this point of view. It is also occasionally stated that the Gothic form may be the continuation of an IE instrumental ending **-ō*. It is the purpose of this note to demonstrate the possibility that the Gothic dative is the result of a syncretism of all these IE case endings, with the except of the locative in **-ōi*, since the Gothic *-a* can be derived phonetically from any of them, and since the Gothic suffix fulfils the functions of all.

According to the usual statement of the Gothic Auslautsgesetze,

² Hans Krahe, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre des Gotischen* (Heidelberg, 1948), p. 120.

³ Cf. F. P. Edgerton, "The Indo-European Semi-Vowels," *Language*, xii (1943), 83-125. On the value of reconstructing *ǣm* instead of Edgerton's *m̥m̥*, see E. H. Sturtevant, *ibid.*, pp. 310 ff.

⁴ Kieckers, p. 107; Krahe, p. 73.

⁵ Kieckers, p. 107; M. H. Jellinek, *Geschichte der gotischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1926), p. 102; W. Krause, *Handbuch des Gotischen* (Munich, 1953), p. 139.

⁶ Fr. Kluge, "Vorgeschichte der altgermanischen Dialekte," *Pauls Grundriss*, I (2nd ed., Strassburg, 1897), 454; E. Prokosch, *A Comparative Germanic Grammar* (Philadelphia, 1939), p. 234.

final *-a* in Gothic can go back to Germanic **-ō*, **-ā*, **-ai* (= IE **-ā*, **-ō*, **-ē*, **-oi*, **-ai*) ± any consonant other than **-s* or **-r*. Thus, we can derive the Gothic dative a priori from an instrumental in **-ē* or **-ō*, an ablative in **-ēd* or **-ōd*, or from a locative in **ē* or **-ō*.⁷ As to the possibility that the Gothic dative might derive from the IE dative ending **-ōi*, the following can be said. As is well known, a sonant in IE in final position after a long vowel was subject to being lost, evidently within the IE period, under certain unknown conditions of sandhi; cf. the Germanic *n*-stems in the nominative, also such pairs as Skt. *mātā*, Gk. Doric *mātēr*; Skt. *āqmā*, Gk. *ākmōn*. As in the case of the *n*-stems, there must have existed sentence doublets in Proto-Germanic (cf. Old Latin *DVENOI*, *AISCOLAPIO*), and, as in the case of the *n*-stems, the West-Germanic languages can have generalized one form, whereas Pre-Gothic generalized the other. Such an assumption would account for the presence of a West-Germanic dative in *-e*, as well as for the preservation in West-Germanic of the distinction between dative and instrumental, lost in Gothic, since final **-ō* did not become *-a* in West-Germanic. In addition, it would account for the supposed lack of a Gothic reflex of the IE dative in **-ōi*.

The Gothic dative thus seems to be phonetically derivable from an IE locative, instrumental, dative, or ablative suffix. Since the Gothic dative fulfils the functions of the locative, instrumental, dative, and ablative, we should not then try to derive it from any one of these cases in IE, but should indicate in our Gothic handbooks that it is the result of a syncretism of all four.⁸

The genitive singular. The Gothic gen. sg. of the *o*-stems is usually derived from an IE suffix **-so*, whereas the genitive singular of the other stems is derived either from IE **-s* or **-es*.⁹ We normally reconstruct, for example, Gmc. **dages/za*, IE **dhogh^weso* for the *o*-stems, Gmc. **gibōs/z*, IE **ghebhās* for the *ā*-stems. The reconstruction of the genitive singular of the *i*-stems and the *u*-stems

⁷ On the IE ending-less locative with lengthened grade, see E. Benveniste, *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen* (Paris, 1935), Chapter 5; H. Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, III (Heidelberg, 1917), 48; cf. also A. Noreen, *Geschichte der nordischen Sprachen* (Strassburg, 1913), p. 163.

⁸ Cp. H. Lewis and H. Pedersen, *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar* (Göttingen, 1937), p. 161 f.: "In Irish the instrumental, ablative and locative fell together with the dative, the resulting case being called the dative."

⁹ It is usually pointed out that IE **-so* as a nominal ending is found only in Germanic. I see no reason why we should not derive the Armenian genitive singular ending *-oy* from IE **-eso* (cf. Arm. *khoyr* 'sister,' from IE **swesor* or *ōr*). This would relieve the difficulties felt by Meillet (*Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique* (Vienna, 1903), p. 48).

presents difficulties, but almost all Gothic scholars are agreed on deriving the *i*-stem ending *-ais* from IE **-oīs* and the *u*-stem ending *-aus* from IE **-oūs*.¹⁰ The second of these IE endings is supposedly well attested by Lith. *sunaūs*, and Lith. *naktēs* is cited in support of the first. One difficulty of such a reconstruction, however, has been overlooked. If we assume that the IE accent fell on the syllable immediately preceding the **-s* in such forms, how can we explain the origin of the ON *-r*, found in the genitive singular of both the *i*- and *u*-stems, as well as in the genitive singular of the *ā*-stems?¹¹ In the case of the *n*-stems also, the usual reconstruction leaves unsolved problems. Gothic *gumins* is normally derived from Gmc. **guminiz*, IE **ghōmenes*. As is shown by the case of the dative plural in Gothic, however (*-m* from Gmc. **-maz/miz*, IE **-mos/mes*), such a form as **guminiz* should have yielded Gothic **gumin*, with regular loss of **-iz* in words of more than two syllables.

I believe that all these difficulties can be done away with if we assume that the IE genitive singular ending **-so*, assumed for the *o*-stems, was present as the genitive singular ending of all stems. We would then reconstruct Germanic **dagez/za*, **gibōs/za*, **anstais/za*, **sunaus/za*, **gumins/za*; IE **dhogh^weso*, **ghebhāso*, **onstoiso*, **sunouso*, **ghōmenso*. The only objection which might be made to assuming a suffix **-so* as a basis for all genitives in Gothic and Germanic is that consonant stems such as OE *burg* show *i*-umlaut in the genitive singular, OE *byrg*. This seems to point to an IE **-es*, Gmc. **-is/z* suffix for the genitive singular of the consonant stems. Since the consonant stems have fallen together in many cases with the *i*-stems in West-Germanic, and since the normal genitive singular of the consonant stems in OE does not have *i*-umlaut, the OE form does not constitute a serious objection. It is believed that the assumption of an IE **-so* suffix underlying all genitive singular forms in Germanic affords us a better explanation for these forms than previously attained.

Washington University

JAMES W. MARCHAND

¹⁰ Kieckers, pp. 114, 116; Krahe, pp. 79, 81; Jellinek, pp. 105, 107; Krause, pp. 148, 150.

¹¹ Cf. also such Gothic forms as *þizoz-ei* and *Filippauz-uh*, demonstrating the existence of a Pre-Gothic **z* in the genitive singular of the *ā*- and *u*-stems.

Roland 602

(O: *Puis si cumencet a venir ses tresors*)

This line, of whose reading in O there can be no doubt, has apparently given trouble ever since its composition. At any rate all the other MSS and translations have some form of *ouvrir* for *venir*. In all but diplomatic editions modern editors before Bédier have the same. Even since Bédier editors¹ have usually emended (e.g. Whitehead *uvrir*) or shown uncertainty (e.g. Mortier, who keeps *venir* but says in a footnote "vraisemblablement *uv(e)rir*"). Only Bertoni² and Roncaglia³ (who substantially follows him) keep the reading of O, but without showing why, in addition to being an apparently 'difficillior lectio,' *venir* actually makes better sense, and is therefore on both counts the correct reading.

Bédier's note in the *Commentaires* (p. 147) is not really relevant, since the difficulty of the line is not caused by the occurrence of the words *tresors* & *venir* in combination—the two extracts from *Guillaume de Dôle* do not prove that *venir* is the right reading here, nor would the non-existence of the combination elsewhere prove that it was wrong in the *Roland*. The question which must be asked is whether *venir* makes sense in the context, and what that context is.

Ouvrir can not be entirely rejected, but common sense would seem to suggest its improbability. Marsilie might, when on a campaign, have his treasure-chest with him, but in his own city of Saragossa it would presumably be stored somewhere safe and left there, not carted into the garden whenever he wished to sit there. (The Norse version gets over this difficulty by inserting the idea of 'rooms,' but since these were presumably some distance away, the idea of 'ordering somebody' has also to be introduced). Furthermore this reading implies that Marsilie opened the chest himself and ignores the fact that he

¹ I have not been able to trace the edition mentioned by Bossuat as '—, Gardner, *La Chanson de Roland* (Woods & Hilton, Boston, 1942).'

² Florence 1935 and 6. Note to this line, after variant readings, says '*uvrir* (che accettano tutti gli editori salvo il Bédier) è "lectio facillior"; e inoltre il Bédier stesso ha citato da Guillaume de Dole vv. 53, 58-9: De l'igliche touz li tresors—Vint encontre a procession. Per il nom. sing. *ses* (accanto *sis*) cfr 783 var, dove *ses nies* è compl. oggetto ma la forma è nominativa.' [O: *apelet ses nies Roll*]; Bertoni actually reads *ad apelet Rollant*.]

³ Modena 1940. Note reads: 'Tutti gli editori, salvo il Bédier et Bertoni, accettano da V⁴ *uvrir* al posto di *venir*. Lo stesso V⁴ ha *cumendet* al posto di *cumencet*.' The second sentence seems to introduce an unnecessary complication, especially as V⁴ has in any case *comēça*. It is the V⁷/Châteauroux version which has *comandet*.

has an official specially to look after the treasure, whom he has to consult about it later. Yet again, why should he open it? and what does he do when he has opened it? He gives nothing of any kind directly to Ganelon or anyone else (the gifts which Ganelon actually receives in this scene are from Valdabrun, Climorin, and Bramimunde, and one hardly feels that even the last would have stepped in before Marsilie if he had been waiting to hand Ganelon a precious gift). *Ouvrir* therefore is completely pointless as a reading.

The same objections hold good to an interpretation as *faire venir*, with *tresors* as Accusative Plural.⁴ There is no point in Marsilie's sending for his treasure unless he is going to do something with it which requires it to come into his presence. But not merely does he not touch it, it does not even appear on the stage at all.

If however we punctuate as follows:

Quan l'ot Marsilie, si l'ad baiset el col.
Puis si cumencet a venir ses tresors.

(or with any other heavy punctuation after *col*), the true shape of the phrase begins to appear. *Ses tresors* is simply the subject of *cumencet a venir* and the point of the remark is that the gifts mentioned in vv. 30-34

(V)os li durrez urs e leons e chens,
Set cenz camelz e mil hosturs muers,
D'or et d'argent. iiii.c. muls cargez,
Cinquante carre qu'en ferat carier—
Ben en purrat luer ses soldeiers.

had not been sent with Blancandrin but kept in reserve. Now that Marsilie's offer and Charlemagne's terms have been accepted, the time has come when they can no longer be withheld. Line 602 is our first reminder of these goods, which we are presumably intended to imagine being collected in the background ready for Ganelon to take away. Then in line 641-645 when

Li reis apelet Malduit sun tresorer:
'L'aveir Carlun, est-il apareilliez?'

Malduit is able to answer

Oil, sire, assez bien:
Vii.c. cameilz d'or et argent cargiez.
E.xx. hostages des plus gentilz desuz cel

⁴ This factitive use of *venir* is not attested (except in instances where an alternative interpretation is probable e.g. *Jeu de Saint Nicolas* 726 'Encore n'avons nous plus venu') but as a theoretical possibility (analogous to the transitive use of *descendre*, & *monter* in Modern French) must be considered, even if only to be rejected.

and probably point to them, since Ganelon mounts and departs immediately afterwards. The *ses tresors* of 602 and the *aveir Carlun* of 642 must obviously be the same—'that part of Marsilie's treasure which is for Charles.'

The context of the line in other words is not lines 601 and 603, with which it has no connection other than a spatial and temporal one, but Laisse III and Laisse LI. It is a reference to what is happening off-stage and like so many of the final lines, its function is that of the chorus, taking us farther away from the reality of the individual scene and bringing us nearer to the reality of the action as a whole.

University of Bristol

GEOFFREY MELLOR

Rimbaud: 'The Doctors' Dilemma

One of the most amusing and at the same time instructive phases of the critical history of Rimbaud is the account which the doctors have given of him. Rimbaud's case history would seem to demonstrate that when the man of science, whether he be in medicine, psychology or psychoanalysis, turns to literary criticism the results can be as catastrophic as if the literary critic were to attempt a frontal lobotomy. The investigations by the doctors do reveal, however, the true nature of the problem in the criticism of Rimbaud and at the same time disclose some of the dangers which confront all literary critics.

Just two months before Rimbaud's death a psychiatrist by the name of Dr. Emile Laurent¹ first seized upon Rimbaud's literary corpse and proceeded to dissect it with great glee. Since very little biographical data had been published on Rimbaud the doctor had necessarily to work from poem back to poet and although he was not sure of Rimbaud's whereabouts and frequently called him "Rimbaud," he did not hesitate to reconstruct the medical history of his subject.

Dr. Laurent was bent on demonstrating that Rimbaud was a lunatic from the similarities he found in the writings of Rimbaud and those

¹ Poètes et dégénérés," *Revue de l'Evolution sociale, scientifique et littéraire*, 1^{er} septembre 1891, pp. 441-446.

of certain asylum inmates. Unfortunately the doctor based the proof of his thesis on two poems which had not been written by Rimbaud at all. The poems had been written by Maurice du Plessys and Laurent Tailhade and published as a literary hoax. In the second half of his article² Dr. Laurent quoted "Les Corbeaux" as an example of the intelligible poetry of which the Decadents were capable if they put their minds to it. At last the doctor had happened, as if in a third time's charm, upon some genuine Rimbaud and his praise was unqualified.

Let it be said for Dr. Laurent that before he republished his articles in book form³ he settled on a consistently correct spelling of Rimbaud's name and eliminated all references to the spurious poems. And before we judge the doctor too hastily for mistaken identifications we have only to remember the recent "Chasse spirituelle" affair and the furor aroused in literary circles by that spurious bit of writing. In addition, by 1891, over sixty years ago now, the Symbolists had not yet been separated from the Decadents by posterity and the critics, and psychiatry itself was a relatively new field of endeavor.

In 1894 Max Nordau's ridiculous book entitled *Degeneration*⁴ was published in French. Nordau was interested only in exposing Symbolism for what it was, "pure mad-house literature." He quoted Rimbaud's sonnet, "Les Voyelles," as the origin of the "mad idea" of some of the Symbolist poets, the "Instrumentalists" headed by René Ghil, who wanted to connect each sound with a definite feeling of color. Nordau concluded that Symbolism was "nothing else than a form of mysticism of weak-minded and morbidly emotional degeneration . . . graphomaniac and delirious twaddle."⁵ In an article on synesthesia⁶ Victor Ségalen took Nordau seriously enough to answer him; and Paul Voivenel, in his thesis,⁷ went so far as to attempt to disprove all relationship between genius and degeneration. It is doubtful that Nordau deserved the attention he was getting but at least they were refutations of sorts.

In 1906 Victor Ségalen himself investigated the personality of

² "Suite," *Revue de l'Evolution*, 15 octobre 1891, pp. 522-527.

³ *La Poésie décadente devant la science psychiatrique* (Paris, Maloine, 1897), VIII & 123 pp.

⁴ Consulted in the edition: New York, Appleton, 1895, XIII & 566 pp.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

⁶ "Les Synesthésies et l'Ecole symboliste," *Mercure de France*, XLII (avril 1902), pp. 57-90.

⁷ *Littérature et folie, étude anatomo-pathologique du génie littéraire* (Toulouse, Gimet-Pisseau, 1908).

Rimbaud.* Ségalen felt it would be a waste of time to develop any of the premises of experimental psychology for none of them would help explain the case of Rimbaud. He found Rimbaud rather to be an example of "Bovarysme," that state of mind in which the "hierachic order of energies" becomes inverted with the consequence that the mind prefers a weaker energy to a stronger and puts all its powers of attentive and conscious effort at the service of a relatively mediocre ability. This was the mechanism of the silence of Rimbaud, according to Ségalen. Rimbaud persisted in disdaining his essential being and all the words that his adolescent being had spoken. Poetic inspriation was not dead in Rimbaud but as a "bovaryste" he had, Ségalen would have us believe, stifled it of his own accord.

Lucien Lagriffe⁹ set about to prove that Rimbaud was neither a split personality as implied by the title of Ségalen's article nor a "bovaryste" as Ségalen had attempted to prove. The transformation from poet to explorer and business man which took place in Rimbaud was not an accident of pathological origin. There was in Rimbaud's personality no scission, nothing which resembled mental derangement, deterioration or substitution. If Rimbaud changed it was not through a split in personality but by renunciation. Neither did Rimbaud present a clear-cut case of "Bovarysme" according to Lagriffe, since Rimbaud was almost as successful an explorer and business man as he had been a poet. Since he was equally at home in both professions it could not be said of him that he dreamed of becoming an explorer and failed to achieve that ambition. Lagriffe found the most important morbid phenomenon in Rimbaud's personality to be the frequent flights. They permitted Lagriffe to diagnose Rimbaud as a "larval paranoiac." The flights presented the characteristics typical of ambulatory paranoia since they were motivated less by curiosity than by a thirst for liberty. Like certain paranoiacs Rimbaud also excelled in the humbler occupations. The transformation of Rimbaud from poet to explorer Lagriffe found to be a simple progression in the way of the paranoiac, from the "larval paranoiac" to the "repentant paranoiac." The psychological makeup remained the same, only their exterior manifestations changed.

* "Les Hors-la-loi. Le Double Rimbaud," *Mercure de France*, LX (15 avril 1906), pp. 481-501.

⁹ "Un Problème psychologique. Les deux aspects d'Arthur Rimbaud (1854-1891)," *Journal de psychologie normale et pathologique*, VII (novembre-décembre 1910), pp. 499-523.

In 1912 Doctors Rémond and Voivenel¹⁰ attempted to demonstrate that the main cause of Rimbaud's difficulties was alcohol. A psychopathologic analysis of Rimbaud's poetic output showed that there was first a period of powerful and almost always honest poetry. After the contact with Verlaine and the decadent milieu in Paris there was a period of transition followed by the final period of the poems in prose which clearly illustrated the intellectual disorder brought about in Rimbaud's mind by his extended alcoholic intemperance in the company of Verlaine. The doctors were happy to conclude that Rimbaud was one of the few who escaped successfully from alcohol and ceased to drink and write in order to become a man again.

Another thesis writer, J.-Henri Lacambre,¹¹ found Rimbaud to be a constitutional psychopath whose mental unbalance was characterized by intellectual, emotional and reactional unbalance as evidenced by constitutional mania, melancholia and a cyclothymic state attested to by the numerous flights. Rimbaud's literary works were nothing more than a manifestation of his state of mental inferiority. Lacambre concluded that Rimbaud was a partial genius, a superior amateur, and after all only the happiest or rarest variant of the average man.

Jules de Gaultier, who had already propounded the theory of "Bovarysme," also investigated Rimbaud's split personality.¹² He found that Rimbaud's existence, which seemed so enigmatic and so divided, was on the contrary ruled by one guiding principle: the refractory character of his sensitivity, the basic incompatibility between his own nature and social nature. That which drove Rimbaud to the life of the desert was a secret horror of social life, the horror of living among men to whom he had once attempted to make himself understood in the language of Orpheus, only to find the sensitivity of others constrained and domesticated by the arid words which made up their vocabulary. In the process Rimbaud's sensitivity was wounded, wounds which he was all too ready to return. Thus Rimbaud, according to Gaultier, fled social life first in lyricism and finally in the African desert in order to avoid these wounds.

Dr. Delattre also felt that the problem of the genius of Rimbaud

¹⁰ Dr. A. Rémond et Dr. Paul Voivenel, *Le Génie littéraire* (Paris, Alcan, 1912), 304 pp.

¹¹ *L'Instabilité mentale à travers la Vie et les Œuvres littéraires de Jean-Arthur Rimbaud* (Lyon, La Source, 1923), 66 pp.

¹² "Le Lyrisme physiologique et la double personnalité d'Arthur Rimbaud." *Mercur de France*, CLXX (1^{er} mars 1924), pp. 289-308.

was a problem for psychiatry.¹³ In view of Rimbaud's superior intelligence the incoherence demonstrated in his works could have been the effect only of a psychical deviation. Rimbaud was in essence a negativist convinced of the necessity of the idea of change and destruction. If he was a misogynist it was not the result of a physical disorder or inversion of sexual instinct but rather of a cerebral order and willed just as his aversion for every normal ideal. On one hand Rimbaud's literary career superimposed itself chronologically on the period of his puberty and on the other the epoch in which Rimbaud conceived the most esoteric part of his work corresponded to the period of his cerebrotoxic excesses. Dominated as his work was by a manifest psycho-motor instability and presenting as it did all the characteristics of toxic delirium, Dr. Delattre could conclude that Rimbaud's literary adventure was in some ways the psychical equivalent of a crisis of growth. The renunciation of poetry was at the same time an admission of powerlessness and the termination of the inhibitive action of exogenous intoxication.

Dr. Jacquemin-Parlier's study¹⁴ agreed in many respects with that of Dr. Delattre. However Dr. Jacquemin-Parlier would diagnose the difficulty as superior degeneration. Rimbaud's words were the very expression of toxic delirium, mainly hallucinatory and affecting above all the sense of sight while at the same time leaving the conscience of the invalid intact. Since the delirium seemed to appear at the will of the poet and since once it had passed Rimbaud again took up a sober if not completely normal life, the doctor would make the diagnosis: superior mental degeneration with, for the period of literary production, toxic delirium super-added. Rimbaud knew that by drinking excessively in order to obtain the hallucinations necessary to the "voyant" he was risking his health and perhaps even his life. But Dr. Jacquemin-Parlier felt that Rimbaud made this sacrifice with a blitheness of heart and immolated himself deliberately for his art, thus attaining the highest degree of the sublime and becoming more than a man.

Speaking psychoanalytically Garma¹⁵ found that Rimbaud's flights represented an attempt to find psychic equilibrium. This line of

¹³ Dr. Jean-Luc Delattre, *Le Déséquilibre mental d'Arthur Rimbaud 1854-1891* (Paris, Le François, 1928), 91 pp.

¹⁴ Dr. E. Jacquemin-Parlier, *Un Diagnostic médico-littéraire: Le Poète Ardennais Jean-Nicolas-Arthur Rimbaud* (Strasbourg, Editions Universitaires, 1929), 85 pp.

¹⁵ "Essai de Psychanalyse d'Arthur Rimbaud," *Revue française de Psychanalyse*, x (1938), pp. 383-420.

investigation led Garma to interpret the conclusion of "Le Bateau ivre" as an example of impossible aggression. Rimbaud's often quoted desire to rehabilitate love was interpreted above all as a desire to liberate the genital libido from its repression, in triumphing over the fear of castration. Flights, abnormal love, wandering over the face of the earth, all was an attempt to resolve the psychic conflicts from which Rimbaud suffered. All was also defeat and Garma suggested that this defeat was also unconsciously sought by Rimbaud.

Speaking psychologically Dr. Auvinet¹⁶ thought that the basis for the irreducible contradiction of Rimbaud's personality might be found in his refusal to submit to the cosmic reality of the universe. The enigma of his life could be found in this revolt, congenital, absolute and morbid which placed the problem of his literary renunciation and of his human defeat at the very origins of love and hate. Rimbaud was, from birth, crucified in spite of himself, a martyr who hated his cross and whose cross tormented him. In his unhappy story we each find, according to Dr. Auvinet, a little of our own childhood. We realize that throughout his life Rimbaud remained the child which we have more or less known ourselves to be.

Speaking physiologically Dr. Cossa¹⁷ observed that Rimbaud underwent a period of abnormal growth and deforming acromegaly. He would diagnose the case as "hyperantehypophysis of puberty." Since the hypophysis is the pituitary body the doctor could also account for Rimbaud's excessive sexual appetite. Dr. Cossa remarked that the work of the spirit such as poetic creation conformed to laws quite different from those of the instinct and that the physiologist and doctor had no place in such investigations. He was only able to verify, in Rimbaud's case, the chronological correspondence between the phase of pubescent excitation and the period of literary production.

The latest medical study of Rimbaud was that of Dr. Fréret.¹⁸ He proposed that the problem of Rimbaud's sudden and final silence was nothing more than an illusion of history. Rimbaud was always silent, for the "voyant" was indeed "un autre." The various works managed to escape the silence and were but its imperfection. Rimbaud's prodigal use of the word "tout" characterized demented megalomania and the realm of exile, with its inhabitant who was

¹⁶ Dr. Louis-Francis Auvinet, *Aspects psychologiques d'Arthur Rimbaud* (Bordeaux, Delmas, 1941), 125 pp.

¹⁷ Dr. Paul Cossa, "Une Hypothèse physiologique concernant Arthur Rimbaud," in Pierre Arnoult's *Rimbaud* (Paris, Michel, 1943), pp. 22-24.

¹⁸ Dr. Jean Fréret, *L'Aliénation poétique* (Paris, Janin, 1946), 332 pp.

nothing less than "son of the sun" and "angel," was nothing more than an imaginary world of narcissistic satisfactions. The constant conflict in Rimbaud's mind between his generous flights of fancy and his desires for expansion and revolt, coupled with the anxious fear of loss or failure which thwarted and inhibited him, gave conclusive evidence of his inferiority complex. The duplicity which united in Rimbaud a personality which at the same time offered and demanded, seduced and dominated, begged and struck, always divided against itself, always ready to betray itself, was the secret of the whole attitude which essentially characterized Rimbaud: defeatism. Controlled as it was by the inevitable Oedipus complex, Rimbaud's aggression was sadistic. The intellectual enfeeblement which followed the period of delirium, taking place as it did in a person as young as Rimbaud, would indicate dementia praecox. The nature of Rimbaud's prodigious poetic accomplishment was more like an act of memory resembling the phenomenal feats of reciters of whole pages from the newspaper or calendar calculators. For they are all stigmatized by degeneracy and even retrogression. The adolescent's unbalanced metabolism produced a thirst of nervous origin. His thirst was not drunkenness but a state of continual physical alteration which appeared with puberty. Hereditary defects, along with a serious malfunctioning of the hypophysis, various types of intoxication, organic fatigue and hyperanabolism would seem, to Dr. Fréret at least, to be the apparent cause for the first confused and hallucinatory blasts from Rimbaud.

This composite portrait, this jigsaw puzzle of the personality and character of Rimbaud which the doctors have pieced together is disturbing.¹⁹ It is difficult to picture one man as a lunatic, "bovaryste," paranoiac, alcoholic, constitutional psychopath, negativist, superior mental degenerate, psychological martyr, acromegalic, megalomaniac, narcissist, defeatist and sadist suffering from an inferiority complex,

¹⁹ Since writing this article I have had the opportunity to consult G. E. Partridge's "Psychopathological Study of Jean-Nicolas-Arthur Rimbaud," *The Psychoanalytic Review*, xvii (October, 1930), pp. 401-425. Dr. Partridge based his investigation upon two sketchy and frequently unreliable sources, Edgell Richword's *Rimbaud, The Boy and the Poet* of 1924 and Henry Beston's *The Book of Gallant Vagabonds* of 1925. In the life of Rimbaud the doctor sees an evolution from protest to rebellion which results in withdrawal. In the poetry he finds a parallel evolution from revolt to visions which results in valedictions. Rimbaud suffered from mother fantasies and as a psychopathic personality underwent something akin to schizophrenic disintegration while suffering from "a transitory catatonic condition," or what might be called "voluntary catatonia," according to Dr. Partridge. The whole syndrome is based upon "distortions in the pregenital stages" leaving Rimbaud "the unemancipated

(Edipus complex and dementia praecox. Rimbaud may very well have been all of those and in being all in general was none in particular. One has the feeling that so much adds up to nothing, that what the doctors have told us hardly exceeds what any one of us might have deduced ourselves from a study of Rimbaud when we consider how large is the present-day, common fund of knowledge, inaccurate thought it may be, of physiological, psychological, and psychoanalytical principles. The great vulgarization would not have been possible however without the sometimes abortive, sometimes constructive contributions by individuals who were also of necessity doctors.

The literary critic can, indeed, profit from the doctors' mistakes. He can witness dramatically the danger of working indiscriminately back and forth from poem to poet. Whether his method be biographical, historical, explication or psychoanalytical, his data must be rigidly controlled. Like Sartre in his recent *Saint Genet*, the critic must go to laborious ends to prove and re-prove his hypotheses. What he can demonstrate about the life of the poet is important only if it illuminates the work. Otherwise such studies degenerate into extra-literary monstrosities like those catalogued by Etiemble in *Le Mythe de Rimbaud*.

On the whole Rimbaud's literary critics have been far more extravagantly careless than the doctors. If, after recognizing the human factor in their judgments, it is disquieting to find Rimbaud so variously interpreted by members of a group as tightly disciplined as the medical profession, then perhaps the literary critic can learn from them a little of his own fate. The feeling persists that Rimbaud, under the burden of eighty years of biased and slovenly criticism, has come to mean all things to all men and that after the point of saturation has been reached he may no longer mean anything to anyone. That, too, is perhaps as it should be in the evolution of literary taste.

University of Delaware

F. C. ST. AUBYN

child." Dr. Partridge concludes that Rimbaud was "a kind of glorified psychopath," all of which does not offer much in the way of an alternative in the doctors' dilemma.

Not available for consultation:

Dr. Jean-Luc Delattre, "Rimbaud et la poésie pure," *La Jeune Académie*, mai-juin 1928.

Marcel Chauzy, "Ce qu'il faut penser de l'influence des toxiques sur l'œuvre de Jean-Arthur Rimbaud," *La Tunisie médicale*, février 1934.

A Note on Lope de Vega's "Soneto de Repente"

Among the sonnets of Lope de Vega few have attained more popularity or wider diffusion than his ingenious sonnet on the sonnet. "Un soneto me manda hacer Violante . . ." is reproduced in most nineteenth and twentieth century anthologies of Spanish lyrics. It is the object of an extensive critical bibliography beginning with Lopez Sendano,¹ who first defended its Spanish origin, and including Lord Holland,² who first seems to have rediscovered its original appearance in Lope's *La niña de plata*; A. Morel-Fatio,³ who traced its imitations in French; Francisco Rodríguez Marín, who examined its Spanish sources⁴ and Altschul⁵ who comments further on its many imitations.

Menéndez y Pelayo, in his introduction to the Spanish Royal Academy's edition of *La niña de plata*,⁶ remarked upon the fame of the sonnet contrasted with the lack of general knowledge of its origin, for this play seems to offer the only known text of the poem printed in the seventeenth century.⁷ This would place the probable date of the composition of the sonnet, if it were written originally as a part of the play, after 1603—the play is missing in the *Comedia* list found in *El peregrino en su patria*⁸—and before 1617—it is to be found in *Parte IX*.⁹ The 1613 date cited by Menéndez y Pelayo¹⁰ has been proved erroneous by H. A. Rennert in his article describing the manuscript preserved in the British Museum which bears that date and the title of *La niña de plata* but which is an entirely different work.¹¹ The investigations of Professor Morley and Bruerton are more restrictive, assigning the play to the period between 1607 and 1612 and more probably to the years between 1610 and 1612.¹²

¹ J. J. López Sedano, *Parnaso español* . . . (Madrid, 1776), vol. iv. The sonnet is reproduced on p. 23 with critical commentary by the editor on p. v of the notes.

² *Some Account of the Lives and Writings of Lope Felix de Vega Carpio and Guillén de Castro*, 2nd ed. (London, 1817), I, 229; II, 223-5. The first edition (London, 1806) has less material on this sonnet.

³ *Études sur l'Espagne* (Paris, 1890), IIIème serie, pp. 153-164.

⁴ *Primera parte de las flores de poetas ilustres de España ordenada por Pedro de Espinosa*. 2a. edición dirigida y anotada por D. Juan Quirós de los Ríos y D. Francisco Rodríguez Marín. (Sevilla, 1896), I, 368-9.

⁵ "Lope-Übersetzungen aus vier Jahrhunderten," *Spanien*, III (1921), 34-6.

⁶ *Obras de Lope de Vega* (Madrid, 1899), IX, cvi-cxv.

⁷ Cf. José Montesinos, *Poesías líricas de Lope de Vega* (Madrid, 1925), I, 284-5.

⁸ *El peregrino en su patria* (Madrid, 1604).

⁹ *Parte IX* . . . (Madrid, 1617).

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. cxiii.

¹¹ "Notes on some comedies of Lope de Vega," *MLR*, I (1906), 107-8.

¹² *The Chronology of Lope de Vega's Comedias* (New York, 1940), p. 225.

Jörder's extensive investigations of Lope's sonnets give us no assistance in this particular case.¹³

As for the sonnet itself, it is considered to be an imitation of similar works of Baltazar del Alcázar, don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, or Hurtado de Mendoza Barros.¹⁴ There is also the possibility of an as yet undiscovered Italian original as Lord Holland and Menéndez y Pelayo suggest¹⁵ or a possible French predecessor as suggested by Marcel Françon in a recent article.¹⁶ This is all we know for certain about this sonnet, its origin and date of composition.

However, entering the *tierra movediza* of allusions and hypotheses, some very interesting and suggestive observations may be made. In a seventeenth century manuscript preserved in the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid there is an apparent reference to this sonnet which may force us to change our dating of this brief work. In the course of a cleverly devised satirical poem, "A las cosas que pasan en el Piru, Año de 1598,"¹⁷ a sharp-tongued, ex-secretary of don García Hurtado de Mendoza of *Arauco domado* fame, Mateo Rosas de Oquendo,¹⁸ attacks the pretensions of the innumerable petitioners always surrounding the viceroy. After commenting on their military exploits:

"Los que fueron al inglés

¹³ *Die Formen des Sonnets bei Lope de Vega* (Halle, 1936), *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, Heft 86.

¹⁴ Although Rodríguez Marín seems convinced of this in his notes (see note 4 sup.), Montesinos does not seem to be so certain (see note 7 sup.).

¹⁵ Holland, p. 229; Menéndez y Pelayo, p. cxv.

¹⁶ "Sur le sonnet du sonnet," *MLN*, LXVII (1952), 46-47.

¹⁷ First published by Paz y Melia from MS 19387 of the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid in *Bulletin Hispanique* VIII (1906), 257-278.

¹⁸ According to Ramírez de Avellano, *Ensayo de un catálogo de la provincia de Córdoba* (Madrid, 1922), p. 561, Rosas de Oquendo was born in Córdoba in 1559. Pablo de Cabrera has made investigations concerning his activities in Tucumán in Argentina, see his article "El Famatina de Rosas de Oquendo" in *Revista de la Universidad Nacional de Córdoba*, Año 8 (1921), pp. 41-58. He has also been the subject of a study by Alfonso Reyes, "Rosas de Oquendo" in his *Capítulos de literatura española*, (1a. serie), pp. 21-72. In addition to the works published by Paz y Melia and Reyes, his only known published work, excluding the fragments cited in note 25 below, is an *otava* in the *Relación historiada de las exequias funerales de la Magestad del Rey D. Phillip II Nuestro Señor . . . por . . . el Doctor Dionysio de Ribera Flores en Mexico*, 1600, fol. 154B. The only known manuscript of the "Sátira" is that published by Paz y Melia although a comparison with the fragments cited in Dorantes (see note 25) shows enough variants to suggest the existence of another manuscript. The only other known manuscripts of Rosas de Oquendo are two copies of his *La victoria naval perutina* now in Madrid, one in the Biblioteca Nacional (MS 3912, foll. 1-8), and the other in the Biblioteca de Palacio (MS 3560), both cited by Vargas Ugarte in his *Manuscritos peruanos en bibliotecas y archivos de Europa y América* (Lima, 1948), vol. V.

cuentan maravillas grandes,
los otros, de la naval,
los otros de Italia y Flandes,
y todos estos senores
fueron alla xenerales. . . ." ¹⁹

he then presents them displaying their literary abilities:

"El uno muestra un soneto
que escribió a Doña Violante. . . ." ²⁰

This last quotation seems to be a concrete reference to the sonnet in question. Appearing in a poem apparently written six years before the earliest possible appearance of *La niña de plata*, this reference antedates by a year both the first known shipment of Lope's work to the Indies, ²¹ and the first recorded production of his work in Perú. ²² Suggesting by its very nature wide popularity for the sonnet, this quotation implies a still earlier date for its composition to thus allow for its arrival and diffusion in the new world by this time.

Acceptance of the validity of this reference may lead us to the inference that the sonnet was written before, and completely independent of, the play. Lope's tendency to use his sonnets on more than one occasion is well known. Montesinos gives several examples, ²³ and only recently Lafuente Ferrari has investigated a more interesting case of this tendency. ²⁴ The validity of this theory in this particular case is reinforced by the fact that there is no other mention of a Violante in *La niña de plata* and that these lines serve no definite function in the dramatic structure of the work.

As an argument against the validity of this allusion and its implications there is always the possibility of a pure coincidence. The assonant rime of the *romance* in -a — -e may possibly explain the use of "Violante." Also there is the difficulty in verifying the date of the manuscript of the "Sátira. . ." This second point, however, seems to be fairly well clarified by the fact that in a manuscript of

¹⁹ *Bulletin Hispanique* (VIII), 1906, p. 263, ll. 635-640.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 263-4, ll. 653-4.

²¹ The date of the first known shipment of Lope's works to the Indies was 1599. See I. Leonard, "Notes on Lope's Work in the Spanish Indies," *HR*, VI (1938), 277-293.

²² The first performance took place in Lima on March 19, 1599, according to G. Lohmann Villena, *El arte dramático en Lima durante el virreinato* (Madrid, 1945), p. 75.

²³ "Contribución al estudio de la lírica de Lope de Vega," *RFE*, XI (1924), 299.

²⁴ "Un curioso autógrafo de Lope de Vega," *Revista de Bibliografía Nacional*, Madrid, v (1944), 43-62.

1604 of undisputed authenticity, Baltasar Dorantes de Carranza, *Sumaria relación de las cosas de la Nueva España*,²⁵ there appear quotations from this "Sátira . . .," including the same lines which concern us here.²⁶ With regard to Lope's use of sonnets in more than one place in his works, it must be acknowledged that the general trend was for his sonnets to proceed from comedias to collections of lyrics rather than in the opposite directions as is suggested here, but this objection cannot be weighed too heavily since movements of the second type are not entirely unknown in his works.²⁷

Thus it seems that we may very well look to this allusion to introduce a new phase to the investigations concerning this sonnet. If it is accurate it will modify the dating of the sonnet, definitely placing it before 1604, the date of its appearance in Dorantes, and probably before 1598, the apparent date of Rosas de Oquendo's "Sátira. . . ."

American Embassy,
Santiago, Chile

HEWSON A. RYAN

Situation as a Term in Literary Criticism Again

In *MLN* 59 (1944) 392, the late Professor H. C. Lancaster called attention to the first attestations of French *situation* in the technical meaning (defined by the NED) 'a particular conjunction of circumstances (esp. one of a striking or exciting nature) under which the characters are presented in a novel or play,' some of his examples showing the authors' hesitancy, characteristic in the case of a neologism, in using the term:

Brueys (1699): [I have, in my tragedy, added certain characters] qui m'ont fourny de nouvelles situations, et une castastrophe diferente.

Dufresny (1702): On aime a voir [in comedies] des situations qui surprennent.

Malezieu (1711): . . . les scituations, c'est le mot à la mode, les événements extraordinaires et imprévus, des passions outrées. . . .

Nadal (1738): Situation en fait de Tragédie, est souvent un état intéressant

²⁵ Published by Agreda y Sánchez (Mexico, 1902). The quotations from Rosas are found on pp. 150-53, and 233-4. See *supra* note 18.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 233-4.

²⁷ Montesinos, "Contribución . . .," p. 299.

et douloureux: c'est une contradiction de mouvements qui s'élèvent tout à la fois, et qui se balancent; c'est une indécision en nous de nos propres sentiments [the example given by the author is Corneille's *Cid* in which "Rodrigue est entre son honneur et son amour, Chimène entre le meurtrier de son père et son amant"].

While grateful for this collection of examples which the eminent historian of the French theatre was able to produce out of the abundance of his reading, we may perhaps miss a satisfactory explanation of the genesis of this indispensable term of modern literary criticism. Professor Lancaster sees a relationship between the latter and the metaphorical use of *situation* by Bossuet in 1670 (the courage shown by Henriette d'Angleterre "s'est trouvé par sa naturelle situation au-dessus des accidents les plus redoutables") and by Father Bouhours who, in 1682, stated that this term had come to be recently used as a more elegant equivalent of *assiette* (f. ex. *son esprit n'est jamais dans une même situation*): the extension of the term from the physical meaning (which it had exclusively before the 17th century, cf. Brunot, *Hist. d. l. l. fr. IV*, 1, 583) to the moral seems to Mr. Lancaster to be attributable in part to the influence of churchmen (Bossuet, Bouhours, Brueys, Nadal, etc.), and the "fictional" development to the "increase of interest in criticism so characteristic of the late seventeenth century in France." The appearance of *situation* as a term of literary criticism in Brueys must indeed be ascribed in part to this 17th century movement, but I am doubtful whether the influence of churchmen is here of any impact (Molière, too, speaks of *une âme bien située*). The word family of *situer*, *situé*, *situation* replaces *assiette*, it seems to me, thanks to the proliferation of Latinisms in the scientific writings of the Renaissance: Mr. Lancaster quotes indeed the first attestation by the *Dict. général* of the word in French in a text of the 14th century: in Raoul de Presles' *Cité de Dieu: la situation ou position des estoilles*, and also the 16th century passage of Lemaire de Belges on cosmography which contains the phrase *la situation de la terre*—clear echoes of the medieval Latin coinage *situatio* (attested in other meanings by DuCange) and *situatus* which already with Augustine replaced the Latin participle *situs* (Ernout-Millet) from which these formations are derived. But why in 17th and 18th century French criticism would precisely this Latinism become fashionable (*le mot à la mode*, Malezieu)?

To the two first French attestations of *situation* offered by Mr. Lancaster I would add the significant passage from Rabelais' *Gar-*

gantua (1534), ch. XXIIIS "là [on the night sky] notoient les cometes, sy aulcunes estoient, les figures, situations, aspectz, oppositions et conjunctions des astres." Here *situation* appears in its, as I believe, original connection with other terms of astronomy, or rather astrology: the Lefranc edition explains *aspects* ("on appelait ainsi les positions de deux astres, l'un par rapport à l'autre. Les astrologues faisaient de ces différents aspects le fondement de leurs prédictions: il distinguoient les astres 'bénins' . . . des astres 'malfaisants'") and *opposition-conjonction*: "suivant la différence de longitude l'aspect prenait le nom d'*opposition* ou de *conjonction*. R.[abelais] dit ailleurs. . . 'La lune en *conjonction* du soleil n'apparoist en ciel, ne en terre; mais en son *opposition* . . . reluist en sa plénitude."¹ Similarly the *Deutsches Fremdwörterbuch* of Schulze-Baseler mentions *Konjunktion* (attested first in Paracelsus, 1530; < Lat. *conjunctio*) and its synonym *Konjunktur* (formed in later Latin: *conjunctura*),² reflected by English *conjunction* in 1605 and "only by chance" attested later in German: 1689,³ both meaning a 'conjoining,' a proximity of heavenly bodies, as "medieval astrological terms," comparable to and synonymous with *constellation* (attested with Paracelsus 1530; < Latin *constellatio*) and *Aspekten* (attested in Germ. 1519).⁴ It is not an effect of chance that Schulze-Baseler list together the same words as Rabelais in his passage (only *constellation* is missing in the latter).

It is then evident that *situation* was originally an astrological-astronomical term inherited from the Middle Ages and still used by

¹ More explicitly the *Dict. gén.* says, s. v. *conjonction*: "Position de deux astres par rapport à un troisième quand une droite partant du centre de ce dernier passe par le centre de deux autres," and s. v. *opposition*: "Position de deux astres par rapport à un troisième, quand une droite passant par le centre de ce dernier rencontre d'un côté le centre du premier astre, et de l'autre le centre du second." *Conjonction* in the astronomical sense is attested in Fr. since the 13th century (FEW, s. v. *conjunctio*).

² For *conjoncture* in modern French cf. Livet, *Lexique de la langue de Molière* and FEW, s. v. *conjungere* (it is, of course, wrong to list our term under the latter heading as though it were a French derivation from the verb: in truth, **conjunctura* must be an inter-Romance coinage).

³ In the obviously derived meaning 'situation, condition, circumstances' the German *Konjunktur* (which later was restricted to the commercial language: *die Konjunktur der Börse*) is attested earlier: 1618.

⁴ In this German attestation the *Aspekten* are explained by *Zugesellung, zugesellen* (said of the moon and the planets) which would be rather the literal rendering of *conjunctio* or *conjunctura*—obviously because both terms are nearly synonymous. Another rendering of the same concept is Germ. (*Schicksals*) *fügung*, 'fateful concatenation of events' (from *fügen*, 'to join'). The German dictionaries treat such semantic developments as German, not as loan-translations from Latin (as they should).

Renaissance astronomers (who were not free from astrological thinking, cf. D. C. Allen's book, "The Star-Crossed Renaissance"⁵) and that its preponderance over *assiette* is due to the scientific connotation of that Latinism. It is not as a churchman that Bossuet introduces the phrase *sa naturelle situation au-dessus de . . .*, but as a man versed in the science of his days.

Now the "fictional" use of situation is simply a transfer from the astronomical-cosmological connotation the word had with Raoul de Presles, Lemaire de Belges and Rabelais. If we consider the analysis by Nadal of the *situation* in a play such as the *Cid*, we see that what he says of the protagonists is only a variant of what could be said of the situation relative to each other of heavenly bodies; "Rodrigue *est entre son honneur et son amour*, Chimène *entre le meurtrier de son père et son amant*." This is a 'conjunction,' this time not of stellar forces exerting their influence on man but of inner forces within man, and it may be conjectured that, the Cartesian view of man having imposed itself on the French *tragédie classique*, it was the dramatic interplay between the inner forces within man that replaced the former astrological pattern and that it was this Cornelian development that lies ultimately at the basis of *situation* — 'une contradiction de mouvemens qui s'élèvent tout à la fois et qui se balancent,' as Nadal phrases it. It is no chance that *situation* is used by him precisely in analysing a typically Cornelian 'situation.'⁶

It must be noted that *situation* is not the first term that, from an astrological context, found its way into literary criticism. Professor Lancaster writes: "Situations had of course, existed in literature long before the seventeenth century, but early critics had been so deeply concerned with form and other matters that they were slow in feeling the need for the new use of the word." I hasten to state that, on the contrary, as early as the 12th century the need was felt by a connoisseur of psychological intricacies for using an astrological term for "the

⁵ By Du Cange an interesting legal case is reported for the 15th century: so-called *medici scientifici* inquire about a case of a man who died in the moment of the *coïtus* and decide that the latter was intercepted by a *con-junctio solis et lunae*.

⁶ Here is a well-known characterization by Lanson, striking in its similarity to Nadal's, of the 'mechanics' of a Cornelian play: "La structure de ses meilleures pièces est remarquable: tant les forces qui sont en présence sont exactement opposées, se contrepèsent, se composent, se dévient, s'annulent, s'entraînent, avec une sûreté, de calcul qui est prodigieuse. Ces jeux de caractères sont d'étonnans problèmes de mécanique morale. Chaque caractère est analysé, pesé, dosé, de façon à concourir dans la juste mesure à l'action totale."

particular conjunction of circumstances under which the characters are presented in a novel": I am alluding to the well-known passage in the prologue to Chrestien de Troyes' *Erec*, ll. 13-14 [Chrestien] . . . *tret d'un conte d'avanture/une mout bele conjointure*. Foerster translates *conjointure* 'favorable, suiting occasion,' 'happening, event,' Nitze, *Romania* 44, 16, 'combination' ('une très belle combinaison'), the FEW, s. v. *conjungere*, 'moral conclusion drawn from a tale.' I would instead propose the translation 'concatenation of events,' 'plot'—a semantic hapax in OF, but very easily explainable from the astrological concept which must also underlie It. *congiuntura* and Sp. *coyuntura* (in the meanings 'occasion, opportunity').⁷ That Chrestien, as past master in the invention of plots, would have used such a metaphor is not astonishing. But his coinage did not impose itself in the course of the centuries as the post-Cornelian term *situation* succeeded in doing.

The Johns Hopkins University

LEO SPITZER

A "Tassosplitter"

All Goethe-editions, so far as I can see, have for lines 1604-05 of *Torquato Tasso* (II, 5) the reading

Er fühle sich gestraft, und strafen heisß
Dem Jüngling wohlthun, daß der Mann uns danke.

Liselotte Blumenthal, in her meticulous accounting of the text of this play (in *Goethe*, Neue Folge d. Jahrbuchs d. Goethe-Ges., 12. Bd., 1950, pp. 89-125), does not indicate any uncertainty about these lines. The "Druckvorlage" in which they occur is a careful copy by Goethe's secretary Vogel (in contrast to Act III, which fared less well at the hands of a different scribe). The resultant first-prints of 1790 (vol. 6 of the *Schriften* and the separate "ächte Ausgabe") have this reading, and to my knowledge it has never been questioned.

Yet it seems to me probable that what Goethe originally wrote (or meant to write) was

Dem Jüngling wehtun, daß der Mann uns danke.

⁷ Cervantes, *Don Quijote*: en esta buena sazón y coyuntura, en mala coyuntura y peor sazón.

The accepted wording makes sense, of course—otherwise it would not have been so universally accepted—but “wehtun,” I suggest, makes better sense as well as having more antithetical force. If a youth is *benefited* by punishment, one might expect thanks already from him; but what seems utter hurt to the youth (as it certainly does to Tasso in the play) may be seen in later years as a benefaction for which the man is grateful.

The slip, if indeed it is one, could have been Goethe's, which escaped his scribe's, or the scribe's, which escaped Goethe's, notice; for Goethe's correction of the manuscript copy, as Frau Blumenthal's examination shows, was rather uneven. Finally, the “Druckerteufel” would have had his chance; and of Goethe's insouciance about his printed texts there are various examples. Within the circumstances, one can only conjecture about the little point.

Columbia University

WALTER SILZ

REVIEWS

Leo Hughes, *A Century of English Farce: A Study of Farce and Low Comedy in the English Theatre from the Restoration to the Middle of the Eighteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1956. vi + 307 pp. \$5.00).

THIS excellent piece of work accomplishes what it sets out to do. It elaborates the complex background against which Farce developed from 1660 to 1750. The elaboration provides a well-balanced presentation in which the author gives just attention to the intricacies of theatre history, actor personality, text preparation, and audience reception. By so doing he keeps his readers constantly in the atmosphere of the theatre. Students of drama and of the 18th century have long needed a good book on the theatrical afterpiece. Professor Hughes has supplied one on a main ingredient of that type of entertainment. The materials with which he has worked are fragmentary, complex and often half-buried in obscurity. He has dug them out and re-assembled them with exceptional ability—analysing and defining as he goes, yet without sacrificing pace and readableness.

The complexity of his subject is introduced in the first chapter

where in twenty pages he attempts to arrive at a definition, acceptable to the century as well as to us, of the nature of farce. The essence of farce, he concludes is its dependence upon mere laughter. This dependence in turn profoundly affected the structure of the genre. Laughter being by nature transient, even fitful, the kind of drama which elicits it must itself be fitful, full of shifts, surprises and turns. His second chapter, "Structures and Devices," centering on the basic device of the chase, is commended to all students of the stage and drama. His treatments of the afterpiece in general, of rival entertainments, of sources, influences, and actors are commendable all along the line.

His work will appeal to scholars because of its restraint (he makes no extravagant claims for his subject) and because of its scope (his full cognizance of French and Italian as well as of native contributions, and his weaving in of performances in the provinces and in the periphery of London). His work will appeal to readers of a wider circle because of its easy transitions from 18th-century types to their modern counterparts which are uppermost in the frame of reference of all of us. In a long but pleasant chapter on some representative farces he puts us back into the pit, box, or gallery, as well as can be done by words, but constantly reminds us from the pens of 18th-century contemporary authors of the necessity of *seeing* not reading these entertaining bits, "sensible that every thing of a dramatick kind appears on reading little better than a body without life." The representation is all, so the farce, borrowing "more than half its spirit from voice and action, must plead for indulgence in the closet."

Finally, its sound documentation, full and up-to-date bibliography, and index make this book a useful piece of scholarship as well as a delightful piece to read. It will stand long in the field as an exemplary study.

New York University

GEO. WINCHESTER STONE, JR.

William Henry Irving, *The Providence of Wit in the English Letter Writers* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke Univ. Press, 1955. 382 pp. \$7.50). "CURIOSITY is the most prevalent of all our passions," wrote young Boswell in the Advertisement to his correspondence with Andrew Erskine, published in 1763; "and the curiosity for reading letters is the most prevalent of all kinds of curiosity." Whatever one

may think of Boswell's psychology, what he says about eighteenth-century literary taste is perhaps very nearly correct. It is to an exhaustive survey of the literary form about which curiosity was "most prevalent" that the leading authority on John Gay's life and London has dedicated his latest scholarly efforts.

Mr. Irving traces English letter writing from Donne through Cowper, from its beginnings in the seventeenth century through its efflorescence in the eighteenth. He discriminates the types of classical example embodied in the lively, detailed, but essentially serious letters of Cicero; in the more artfully witty letters of Seneca; and in the letters of Pliny, which are at once natural and precious—a combination that anticipates the wit of eighteenth-century expression. The powerful French influence is analyzed into the formally stylized and highly self-conscious art of Balzac; the competing example of the urbane, witty, but natural-seeming Voiture, whose influence on Pope had been earlier perceived by Courthope; and the "culminating miracle" (p. 80) of Madame de Sévigné's epistolary art, unmatched in English until we get to the correspondence of Walpole, who idolized the French lady's "infinite wit" and her ability to "shine both in grief and gaiety" (p. 330). Mr. Irving not only traces the influence of classical and continental example and evaluates the literary qualities of the English writers of the great tradition; he also attempts to derive from these letters the authors' theories of their art. Thus along with an impressive amount of factual information about personal relationships, editorial habits and standards, and social attitudes, there is also presented a series of brief informal essays in critical doctrine that cannot fail to interest the student of eighteenth-century thought.

What I have said already by way of summary has called attention to Mr. Irving's commendably broad learning. It is conveyed in a style that is for the most part agreeably informal, although occasionally it tends to lose itself in irrelevance or in improperly subordinated minor details. Thus the latter part of Chapter III and most of Chapter IV are rather hard going—much of the detail is allowed to seem trivial because it is not fully schematized and the last chapter on the (mostly unlively) Scottish writers is anticlimactic. But one cannot ask that in so extensive a study the interest be maintained always at the level attained in the illuminating quotation from William Guthrie (pp. 52 ff); in the convincing demonstration of Pope's artful simplicity (p. 185); in Lady Mary Wortley-Montagu's lively letter on

nursing (pp. 210-211); in the insights into the way in which Walpole's character, at first repellently superficial, tends to grow on you (pp. 343-344); and in the excellent discussion of Cowper (pp. 346 ff), in which Mr. Irving most suggestively stresses a deep subconscious relationship between Cowper's religious "enthusiasm" and the spontaneity of his letters.

These considerable merits lead us to make two demands which the present study does not fully satisfy. The first is concerned with intellectual context, the second with critical method. Mr. Irving is at his best in dealing with letters as an outlet for "the confessional element in man's nature" (p. 22); he is not equally adequate in relating letters to larger currents of thought and expression. For example, the material presented introduces the concept of the sentimental (p. 242), but this is not related to the sentimentalism of play and novel. The differences between Williamson and Croll on the important matter of changes in prose style during the seventeenth century are not boldly confronted, although Mr. Irving perceives that the implications for epistolary expression are great. The historical circumstances of writing, sending, collecting, and responding to letters must surely bear some relation to the artistic position of letters themselves in the fictions of Richardson. Vioture's and his followers' habit of decorating the trivial cries out to be considered along with mock-epic poetry. And the ideal of natural artifice—of "golden ease" and "simple elegance," as Logan Pearsall Smith once put it—that was so prominent in the letter-writers' conceptions of their own art ought surely to be related to the classical *curiosa felicitas* and to eighteenth-century wit, which was, as Johnson said, "at once natural and new." Perhaps the theory of letter writing would have seemed less unsubtle to Mr. Irving (p. 360), had he related it to the tendencies I have mentioned, allowing it to illuminate them and allowing them to illuminate it.

My second criticism of the *Providence of Wit* concerns critical method and thus grows out of what I have just said. Mr. Irving's title comes from Dryden's poem to Sir. Robert Howard, in which the author asks whether the ease in writing that conceals art comes from chance or effort. He denies the former (beauty does not result from atoms of meaning casually hurled together) and affirms his faith in "the providence of wit"—that is, in the power of intellectually planned art to achieve beauty. From this poem Mr. Irving seems also to derive the two critical principles he everywhere applies: nature and

art, the plain and the precious, the Ciceronian and the Senecan. There is no denying that these principles were conceived of as antithetical in many of the comments of the letter writers here cited. But in the best critics they were thought of not as contradictory but complementary. Wit, in fact, represents their fusion. By using them alternatively and in opposition to one another, Mr. Irving has ignored a central neoclassical insight and has blunted his critical tools in laying open the merits of the best letters. This failure to use the full meaning of wit perhaps explains why Mr. Irving tends to confuse scientific simplicity with epistolary simplicity (pp. 87 ff). The two bear some resemblance to one another but are really not very similar. The letters of Steele and Addison may be simple and direct, from one point of view. But they are in essence highly artful. That they do not seem to be so argues that they are examples of true wit. The same remark applies to Cowper. This is not to deny that there are degrees of naturalness. One would have to admit that the tailored letters of Pope are more obviously artificial than the spontaneous effusions of Cowper. But both types are governed by the "providence of wit." Wit, like conversation, has its levels of propriety. It does not cease to be wit when its artfulness is concealed beneath the surface. Mr. Irving's categories of artificiality vs. sincerity (pp. 91-93), of the "old *politesse*" vs. the "new bourgeois plainness" (p. 178), will simply not do as critical weapons. To this criticism I should add the comment that although he has felt it necessary to use these separated concepts in almost every important context, Mr. Irving seems himself to be aware of their limitations (pp. 178, 346).

Such considerations as these are, in a sense, a tribute to the book. For if it does not answer all our questions, it does send us off to further thought and investigation.

Northwestern University

JEAN H. HAGSTRUM

Christina Keith, *The Russet Coat; A Critical Study of Burns' Poetry and of Its Background* (London: Robert Hale Limited; Fair Lawn, N. J.: Essential Books, 1956. 235 pp. \$3.40). MISS Keith has written something rare, a book about Burns which emphasizes his poetry instead of his amours. It is both stimulating and irritating, penetrating and superficial, displaying admirable critical insight mingled with recurrent errors in matters of detail.

As Miss Keith sees it, the dominant influences on Burns and his work were the Kirk and the native music of Scotland, especially Highland music. Rebellion against the Kirk produced the satires; music, which the Kirk had never been able to tame, produced the songs. Miss Keith is no admirer of Calvinism; she holds that it kept the Scottish mind in a straitjacket for four centuries. Like the Inquisition, it vetoed inquiry; hence Burns had no training in free reasoning. Though few modern readers will question the general statement, some may doubt that Burns, a man of emotions, would ever, under any education, have become a philosopher.

Miss Keith's analysis of the poetry ranges from minute dissection of verbal effects to discussion of the ideas of the major poems and their relations to older Scottish literature. Though inclined to be repetitious, she makes some excellent points. But by minimizing the poet's knowledge of other writers, Scots or English, she returns, in substance, to the old figment of the Heaven-taught plowman. Perhaps her wildest remark is that "It was not until his accident in Edinburgh in 1787 that he took to" reading the Bible (p. 16)—this, with the early letters and the poems full of scriptural allusions ranging from Genesis to Revelation and made with the precision that comes from minute knowledge. All his Edinburgh statement meant was that he was reading the Bible consecutively for the first time in some years. On the very next page she asserts that Burns never read Adam Smith, though his letters to Graham of Fintry prove that he did.

In general Miss Keith seems to ignore the Burns scholarship of the past half-century. Though she lists some recent works in her bibliography, her text indicates little familiarity with anything this side of Henley and Henderson, Angellier, and J. C. Dick. She quotes the letters always from the incomplete and long superseded edition of Scott Douglas, and though her bibliography includes Hecht, Snyder, and Daiches, she omits the latter's first name and gives his book a wrong date and a wrong publisher. This scarcely indicates careful study.

Many of her biographical statements are highly questionable. In the total absence of documentary evidence, for instance, she assumes (p. 26) a close friendship between Burns and David Herd. (She calls the editor William Herd in her text, but gets the name right in the bibliography.) That so important and congenial a relationship could have existed without its being alluded to in the voluminous correspondence with James Johnson and George Thomson is past

belief. Similarly, in asserting (pp. 10 and 16) that Burns was "stone-cold" to scenery, she overlooks an important exception documented by the poet himself. On his Border tour he made a special point of seeing "Elibanks and Elibraes so famous in bawdy song," and he later boasted to Thomson that he had seen every poetic shrine in Scotland except Lochaber and the Braes of Ballenden. In other words, scenery fascinated him when, and if, it had poetic associations.

One might go on to mention that the existing *Merry Muses* is not Burns's, and that he did not write it for the Crochallans (p. 119); that he never met George Thomson (p. 128); that his one letter in broad Scots was to William Nicol, not to William Cruikshank (p. 130). One might also query some of the generalizations about eighteenth century Scotland. To say that "nobody (but Boswell) got drunk in Boswell's Scotland" (p. 39) is to suggest that the writer's reading has been limited to the *Tour to the Hebrides*. And the glowing descriptions of the intellectual life of Edinburgh in 1787 ignore the fact that Burns encountered the city in the doldrums between Hume and Adam Smith before him and Scott and Jeffrey after him. Most of the gentry whom the poet met were second-raters, and he knew it.

It is a pity that so good a study should be marred by such carelessness, for Miss Keith has both wit and acumen, whether in such an aside as "the Scots husband, drunk or sober, just doesn't talk to his own wife" (p. 95), or in a summary like this:

But in sheer intellectual power and brilliance—to lay his finger unerringly on the weak points in an apparently impregnable wall of dogma and expose them, as in the satires—or to pick out the right pieces from a mosaic of old songs and to mould them into a completely new and fascinating whole, as in his songs—no one in Scots literature comes anywhere near Burns.

Of Miss Keith's adverse judgments on some of the much-admired poems it is needless to speak. The Federation of Burns Clubs, which has never sponsored any constructive work on the poet, will make up for its neglect by denouncing her.

Falls Village, Connecticut

DELANCEY FERGUSON

S. T. Coleridge, *Collected Letters*, Vol. I, II, ed. Earl Leslie Griggs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Vol. I: xxxix + 660 pp. Vol. II: viii pp. + pp. 661-1219). THE task of attaining a full and rich interpretation of the works of the Romantics is of an order different from that required for an intensive reading of their predecessors, for the Romantics tended to think and write within their individual private systems of ideas and symbols. In consequence a poem like *Kubla Khan*, far more than such public poems as those of Pope or Johnson, requires that it be considered in the context of all the available utterances of the poet, since its frame of reference is decidedly personal. *The Rape of the Lock* gains rather little from Pope's other compositions; but it would be foolhardy to attempt an understanding of *Prometheus Unbound* without scrutinizing every accessible passage that Shelley wrote.

It is surprising, therefore, how very slowly scholarship has made available the necessary materials for an understanding of Romantic literature, although recent years have seen rapid progress. The editorial labors of de Selincourt and Miss Darbishire have made Wordsworth's writings almost totally available, although it is clear that a few scraps—such as items at Cornell and at Dove Cottage—eluded their search. Keats is almost equally accessible, although it is evident that Garrod's text of the poems requires some corrections from the manuscripts and that Forman's edition of the letters must be checked against Hyder Rollins' annotations. But much remains to be done before we can have real confidence in our understanding of Shelley, Byron, and Coleridge. No doubt important aid will come from the work on Byron being carried on in Texas and from Neville Rogers' revision of the Oxford Shelley. But there is great need of a careful collected edition of Shelley's letters; and it is essential that the Shelley-Rolls manuscripts in the Bodleian Library become available in some printed form. Best of all would be an edition of Shelley's prose and poetry with all the manuscript readings on the order of Garrod's edition of Keats.

Because of the very nature of the man's habits, the problem of getting Coleridge's writings into print is a prodigious one. Although E. H. Coleridge's edition of the poems and Shedd's edition of the prose are sadly in need of revision—for example, we still lack a collated edition of the texts of *The Friend*—this work is temporarily being neglected for the publication of the voluminous manuscript material—the letters, notebooks, and ubiquitous marginalia. Here the labors of Raysor,

Miss Brinkley, and Miss Coburn have contributed much, although there has been some pointless overlapping because of the absence of a controlling plan; and now we are to look forward to the publication by Miss Coburn of Coleridge's notebooks in perhaps as many as ten volumes. It is in the light of this increasing and essential movement to make available all the writings of Coleridge that the value of Griggs' admirable edition of the letters becomes fully apparent.

Unlike Keats, Coleridge was not a writer of charming letters, and the personality the letters reveal is not especially attractive. But they are remarkably full for the purpose of tracing his turns of thought and the movement of his philosophic and theological positions, and because of this they are invaluable for an understanding of what is enduring in Coleridge, his poems and his critical theories. These two volumes, the first of four, cover the years 1785 to 1806. Most of the letters in these volumes, few of which had been unpublished, are drawn from dozens of published sources, the previous scattered distribution having made a coherent study almost impossible; and more than four-fifths have been collated with holographs, so that previous errors have been corrected and many omissions supplied. The most important new letters in these two volumes are a series to Josiah Wedgwood analytic of Locke's philosophy (these have also been published in part, and with a few small errors, in Miss Brinkley's recent *Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century*). But of the 1800 letters Griggs will eventually have published, approximately 600 have not been in print. Griggs' annotations are admirably conservative, supplying precisely the information and cross-references one needs, and no more.

The Johns Hopkins University

EARL R. WASSERMAN

H. C. Duffin, *Amphibian: A Reconsideration of Browning* (London: Bowes and Bowes; Fair Lawn, N. J.: Essential Books, 1956. [x] + 317 pp. \$4.80). THIS volume is the product of an avowed and enthusiastic friend of Browning. Next to his own wife, Mr. Duffin informs us, Browning has had most to do with his mortal happiness. Unfortunately, his book illustrates what the Maréchal Villars must have had in mind when he said that he could cope with his enemies if only he could be defended from his friends. For Mr. Duffin, Browning constitutes an amphibian—"a huge formless genius . . .

a little uncertain as to its essential quality . . . whether it were land-animal or sea-animal." This haphazard genius seized on his verse-patterns in a game of catch-as-catch-can: "The feeling I have about his verse forms is that each one was suggested spontaneously to him by the way the first words of his thought came to him." So also, apparently, with portions of Browning's subject matter: in *Popularity* Browning settled upon Keats simply because the name offered a convenient rhyme for *eats* and *feats*. Mr. Duffin's reading of *Porphyria's Lover* is scarcely less original. Browning appears to have set out to paint a pretty love idyl but ended, because of the exigencies of rhyme, with a murder scene. Mr. Duffin feels we can still rescue the poem from the macabre: "It would evidently make the picture more pleasing if we could take [the words] to mean 'pretended to strangle her,' and since the rest of the poem favours this reading I do not see why we should not get pleasure instead of horror out of the poem." The last two lines of the piece as they stand suggest, to be sure, that Porphyria is dead; but it is likely that Browning contrived the last line merely because he had to put in something "for rhyme's sake."

Amphibian leaves the reader more than a little puzzled as to Mr. Duffin's criteria for great poetry. Within the limits of one paragraph upon *The Ring and the Book*, for example, he tells us that six books of the poem could well be dispensed with entirely or reduced to bare summaries, and that five of the remainder (all except *Pompilia*) ought to be pruned, but that nevertheless *The Ring and the Book* "is a great and wonderful poem." Only in Homer shall we find "an equal zest for life, expressed with a serener art." In the concluding chapter of the book we learn that Browning "had no vision and no art," but three pages later we are assured that Browning is "one of the chief glories of a very great period of literature." This judgment is the more confusing because at the beginning of the same chapter we read that "it is as an artist that [Browning] has to be judged."

Mr. Duffin devotes much space to exegeses of several of Browning's longer poems, but these analyses seem made up in their more reliable sections of garrulous fantasias upon Mrs. Sutherland Orr or Dr. Berdoe.

Indiana University

DONALD SMALLEY

George Eliot, *Middlemarch*, ed. Gordon S. Haight (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1956. xxiii + 613 pp. Riverside Editions. \$1.20).

THE Houghton Mifflin paperbacked Riverside Edition makes an inexpensive, legible *Middlemarch* available at last. Moreover, Professor Gordon S. Haight supplies, in addition to an introduction, the kind of textual and informational footnotes readers of nineteenth-century novels so frequently need and so seldom find. Though neither definitive nor consistently selective, these notes are exemplary in their scope and variety.

The text is based on that of the 1874 edition, the last corrected by the author, with annotations of what the "Bibliographical Note" describes as "some" of these last corrections. In fact, the notes accurately identify only four of the approximately two dozen revisions George Eliot made in the 1874 proof; two other changes the notes attribute to this proof (pp. 178 and 194) the author actually made in the proof of the first edition. Of the four correctly annotated 1874 changes, two—the deletion of "distinctively" from the phrase "with distinctively human hearts" (p. 3) and the change from "Alexander" to "Cyrus" (p. 613)—are no more important than many other 1874 revisions which are omitted from the Riverside Edition—*e. g.*, the correction of the obvious but important error in "so lightened the pressure of sordid cares" to "so tightened the pressure" etc. (p. 473); the deletion of "Socratic" from the phrase, "catechised in this Socratic way" (p. 494).

The Riverside notes also indicate a dozen manuscript readings which differ from the text, readings apparently based not primarily on examination of the manuscript itself, however, but on the revisions George Eliot made in the proof of the first edition.¹ These notes present only a small and random sampling of the changes made in this proof: the largest single revision, for example, the addition of almost fifteen hundred words of text—from "But this very fact," p. 179, to "anything the matter," p. 182—is omitted.

An occasional expansion of a textual note would help the reader unfamiliar with the manuscript or the history of the composition of *Middlemarch* evaluate the significance of a revision: *e. g.*, the changes in the names "Standish" and "Garth" probably have something to do with the joining of the original beginning of *Middlemarch* to the

¹ One note, p. 65, reads as if it is based on a MS and not a proof revision: "In the MS 'Standish' was *originally* 'Shaw.'" (Italics mine.) There was no proof revision at this point, but in revising the MS George Eliot did miss one appearance of "Shaw" which she had then to correct in proof (p. 68).

beginning of a once-separate "Miss Brooke"; the change on p. 348 from "Celia, who was about to have a baby" etc. to "Celia, who had lately had a baby" is undoubtedly related to George Eliot's having moved the birthday of the baby from April in her notebook plans to March in the novel, a shift Prof. Haight himself mentions in his introduction (p. xvi) but not in the note.

There are more than two dozen informational footnotes of admirable variety: provincial words or words used in special senses are defined; guides to pronunciation of proper names are offered; literary and political references are tracked down and where necessary explained; historical dates are supplied. Students, instructors, and casual readers alike will find these notes invaluable.

The informational like the textual notes, however, are neither numerous nor selective enough. Why are Burke and Hare and St. John Long annotated but not Bichat, Vesalius, or Wakely? Why are references to books by Bryant on mythology, Lowth on the prophets, Loudon on cottages annotated but not references to Louis on fever or Robert Brown on plant pollen? Why are Peel's peerage and Huskisson's fatal accident dated in the notes but not the debate on Lord Russell's Reform Bill, the last defeat of Reform in the House of Lords before its final passage, or either of the dissolutions of parliament in 1830 and 1831, when all these dates are of equal importance in fixing the chronology of the fiction? Why is Wellington's position on Catholic Emancipation—mentioned in the novel in passing—explained in the notes but not Peel's, which is mentioned a number of times in connection with Mr. Brooke and Casaubon, the latter having written a timely pamphlet on Peel's side of the subject which Brooke believes may make him a bishop?

The introduction suffers from an excess of its own virtues. Broad and sensitive, it attempts to deal with all aspects of the novel—with the history of its composition as well as with characterization, with the real-life originals of the characters as well as with imagery—and it strives to appreciate all—Raffles as well as Rosamond, the "unity" as well as the breadth of the novel. Thus it is frequently sketchy and occasionally misleading. The description of the planning and working out of the internal chronology of *Middlemarch* (p. xvi), for example, is so worded that the reader has a difficult time distinguishing those dates which appear in both the notebook and the novel from those which appear in only one or the other. The dates of Dorothea's two marriages—November, 1829, and June, 1832—can accurately be

determined only from the novel; the notebook does not give the month for the first and gives only the wrong month—"Jan. or Feb."—for the second. On the other hand, the date of the birth of Rosamond's baby—June 1, 1831—appears only in the notebook, of course, since in the novel Rosamond miscarries.

The Riverside Edition of *Middlemarch* thus presents an accurate and legible text with helpful and varied notes. Paradoxically, because it offers so much more than we are accustomed to receiving in such an edition, we are disappointed by its being neither definitive nor perfect.

University of Washington

JEROME BEATY

James Baird, *Ishmael* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956. xxviii + 445 pp. \$5.50). MR. Baird's *Ishmael* is a study of the nature and destiny of the modern religious sensibility. Its materials are almost entirely literary, and its primary focus is the work of Melville. Its end is to demonstrate how imaginative writers, sensing the religious crisis in their (and our) culture, have turned to Polynesia and the Orient for a body of symbols which would serve to reintegrate the modern psyche and to give force and direction to its search for spiritual wholeness. Its method—strongly Jungian—is the elucidation and assessment of a series of images, narrative patterns, and the like, deriving from Oriental and Polynesian archetypes. Its devout hope, I would venture to guess, is for a redefinition of religion for modern man, who wanders lonely as a crowd.

Ishmael is a powerful book and a dedicated one, its analytic skill suffused with a sense of mission, so that a reader—this reviewer, at least—is enlightened and moved even when he is not convinced. Mr. Baird calls the writers he studies—besides Melville, principally Pierre Loti, Henry Adams, Hearn, Leconte de Lisle, and Verhaeren—primitivists; and by this he means that they strove to realize certain culturally primal ideas of the very source of life, that they discovered those ideas in the Orient and Polynesia, and that they employed them in the realization of religious values and meanings at large. (The earnest reviewer must point out that Mr. Baird would not approve of the word "ideas," since for him the matters he deals with are beyond ideology and the intellect.) These ideas are, in Mr. Baird's terms, "genuinely" primitive. Beyond them the creative writer cannot go;

in fact, he can express them only in his deeply and perforce universally personal sense of them. Melville and the others are thus for Mr. Baird in varying degrees creators of "autotypes" of the primal Oriental "archetypes" which constitute the world of the psyche. *Ishamel* is, in effect, a series of explicatory essays on such autotypes, primarily as they occur in the work of Melville.

Since in Mr. Baird's view what gives urgency to this turning to Polynesia and the Orient is the failure of Christianity to furnish a solidly integrating basis for modern spiritual life, it is natural that he should view Melville and the others as they are able to conceive of the possibility of supplanting Christian with Polynesian and Oriental archetypes. He moves powerfully from theoretical and biographical considerations to a brilliant central study of Melville, which consists of a lengthy review of this process—of, as he says, avatars of Oriental archetypes as they give life to Melville's work. Thus where there is in Christian thought (here "thought" is the reviewer's question-begging word, of course) the sacrament of the Eucharist, there is in Polynesian thought that of *tayo*, as exemplified in the friendship of Ishmael and Queequeg and the sacrifice of Billy Budd. For Christian holy orders there is the Polynesian idea of the sage, above all as exemplified by the career of Queequeg. For the Christian God there is the all-encompassing divine indifference of the Whiteness of the Whale. For the limited Christian idea of evil there is a sense of the primal mind, absolute, beyond good and evil, in Fedallah, a sense of primal animism in many of Melville's images of Polynesian places, and a sense of primal eros in his various images derived from Polynesian phallicism. In each case the Oriental-Polynesian archetype is found, in terms of Melville's autotypical evocation of it, to be more fecund in meaning, more expressive of the human situation, and thus more commanding of assent than is its presumably disintegrative Christian equivalent. But tabulating examples thus—and I give only a very few of them—grossly oversimplifies the provenience, depth, and complexity of Mr. Baird's work. It consists of a sensitive elucidation of an enormous multitude of details and a construction of the clear but shape-shifting patterns which those details make. And we are—or at least I am—convinced at the end that a large portion of the world which Melville made had its origins as much in Polynesia and the Orient as in his own creativity.

However, Mr. Baird seems to be convinced that this is Melville's whole world, or at least his primary world. And here it is somewhat

difficult to follow him. He begins with two assumptions which he expresses again and again, but which he never permits himself to question, perhaps cannot permit himself to question. The reviewer can and must do so. In the first place, there is the assumption that the crisis of our culture is that of a failure of Chistian sacramentalism, that we suffer from a disintegrative "ego-sicknes of the self," that we need a sense of divine community in which the self can find a new indentity. In the second place, there is the assumption that Carl Jung has led the way to this realization, that his psychology furnishes the best means to moving from critical analysis to the philosophy of religion—which is to say, furnishes Mr. Baird his method. The force of this assumption and the direction of his method lead him to what I take to be some unjust and overstrained statements. (He writes best, incidentally, when he is evoking a Melvillean autotype; he writes worst, in the perhaps necessary jargon of the interdisciplinary critic, when he is theorizing and when he is in effect excommunicating, as he too often is, those who are not of his persuasion. He is not one to say, "Perhaps . . ." or even "I deny your major . . ."). He misunderstands, in his early pages, primitivistic writers who are not of his kind; their genuineness would seem to be suspect because they do not commit themselves to some form of the myth of the eternal return, that myth which is for him quintessentially ("genuinely") primitivistic. But then, the uncommitted student of primitivism (that is, one writing in the *persona* of a reviewer) replies, they did not intend to; they simply tried to refine their own sense of civilized mission by judging it in terms of a theory of the nature of primitive life which does not happen to be Mr. Baird's, Jung's, or perhaps Melville's; they are none the less "genuine," even though they do not envisage proper primitivity as Mr. Baird does. Moreover, Mr. Baird is so secure in his (and others', to be sure) notion of "ego-sickness" that he cannot entertain the possibility that what may be emerging in recent philosophy—not to say psychiatric and anthropological theory—is a sense of the possibility (*just* a possibility) of ego-health. Mr. Baird seems to be a committed Jungian, so that he must have everything his Jungian way.

Much of Melville, as I have tried to indicate in this review, seems, in the light of *Ishmael*, to move along this way. It can be said, thus, that to a noteworthy degree Melville anticipates Jung's eastward journey in search of his soul. But it is just possible that the meaning that Melville derives from his Polynesian and Oriental avatars is not

what Mr. Baird at his most Jungian would like it to be. For there is something static in Mr. Baird's view of Melville. Melville's art is made out to be more revealed than revealing, more lyric than dramatic. It is as though he had written odes, not stories. There is a kind of vitality in the tragically Protestant Melville, the writer best known to us, of which Mr. Baird has taken little account. There is in *Ishmael* little or no sense of the movement and growth, the sheer plottedness, which are so important a part of *Moby-Dick* in particular. There is not much sense of what we have recently learned to call the *novelistic* quality of the book. It is, after all, a narrative; and something happens to Ishmael; indeed, *he* happens and retrospectively views himself as happening. A Jungian view of Ishmael's adventure as a heroic rebirth simply cannot take its novelistic quality adequately into account. One wonders—to suggest an antipodal possibility—how it would be if Mr. Baird had approached *Moby-Dick* as, say, an enlightened Freudian, with a concern for the prime experiential quality of the novel, with a concern for its narrative as something worked through, with an eye on the Ishmael who is creating a novel in order to create himself, with a counter-Jungian assumption as to the potential sufficiency of the ego. One might then say simply that Melville's Polynesian and Oriental materials urged themselves into his consciousness powerful enough to enable him to recreate them in such a way as to make his Ishmael appear to evoke them in the course of his attempt to define, after the fact, the meaning of his terrific voyage on the *Pequod*. The materials would be archetypal then only in the sense that they attracted Melville and that he was able to make them attract us. The problem of the genesis of this attraction for both Melville and his readers would be a difficult one, of course, but it would be extra- (or pre- or infra-) critical. Such an approach would at least have the virtue of coming at *Moby-Dick* as a whole, which Mr. Baird, it seems to me, does not. Moreover, it would give Melville, as artist, an independent status that Mr. Baird's autotypography of his work does not allow him.

One does not wish that Mr. Baird had written a different book; one only wishes that he could have entertained some other possibilities and thus have written either a larger or a more cautious book. Perhaps then he could have made something, say, of Bulkington, whom he does not mention, and of the manipulation of point of view in the novel, of the carefully worked out division of Ishmael into actor and narrator, and of crucial shifts in tone and style. Perhaps

he would have been able to take into account the Melville who, in the *Moby-Dick* period, wrote in a celebrated letter to Hawthorne from which Mr. Baird does not quote: "He says No! in thunder; but the Devil himself cannot make him say *yes*. For all men who say *yes*, lie; and all men who say *no*,—why, they are in the happy condition of judicious, unincumbered travellers in Europe; they cross the frontiers into Eternity with nothing but a carpet-bag,—that is to say, the Ego." This Melville seems not to have been suffering from what Mr. Baird calls ego-sickness. Moreover, this Melville would not seem to have been primarily an evoker of archetypes. He does not seem to have needed the sort of depersonalizing individuation (in the Jungian sense) which appears to be Mr. Baird's goal for him.

Ishmael, is, in short, like all books which would change our minds, one which a reader must use with caution, lest it use him. It is, in fact, not a book about *Ishmael* but about a Jungian view of *Ishmael's* world. Jung furnishes a cautious reader the most useful gloss here: "I hold," he wrote, "Kerenyi to be absolutely right when he says that in the symbol [read "autotype of archetype"] the *world itself* is speaking." This does not take sufficiently into account that *Ishmael* himself also speaks and grows and creates. Nonetheless it does take into account a good deal of *Moby-Dick*, of Melville, and of the world which Melville shared with the other writers whom Mr. Baird treats. Even if one cannot steadily view that world in Mr. Baird's perspective, he can begin there and see much that he has not seen before. Moreover, he can realize the nature of the perspective and the power of Mr. Baird's vision. The truest and most compelling thing about *Ishmael* is that, beyond its careful analysis and scholarship and learning, it is visionary.

The Ohio State University

ROY HARVEY PEARCE

Mary Reifer, *Dictionary of New Words* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. ix + 234 pp.). GENERAL interest in new words and meanings during the past decade can be measured in part by the fact that during this period several yearbooks have added articles devoted to a selection of the words of the year. A further piece of evidence lies in the dictionary before us, described on the jacket as "A work of scholarly accuracy covering all new words of the last few decades."

Whether or not the second part of this statement will appear extravagant to the general reader, toward whom the book seems chiefly aimed, it will give the student pause. Do the 5175-odd entries of this dictionary with some run-ons contain all the new words of the "last few decades"? Actually they do not. The 1954 *Addenda Section* of the 1934 *Webster's New International Dictionary* contains around 4050 entries, some with run-ons. According to my sample, approximately half of them are not included in Miss Reifer's work. It would have been better for the writer of the description on the jacket to speak of "a selection of the new words." Mr. Eric Partridge is more cautious when he admits in his interesting Introduction (p. vi) that because of human fallibility the reader will "occasionally" not find here a new word he wishes information about.

The general reader wants first of all clear, concise, non-technical definitions, and Miss Reifer has abundantly supplied him with them. Occasionally, however, the user will be left unsatisfied; for example, the nine-word definition of *homeostasis* is inadequate, and illustrations are needed for *morphoneme*, *phoneme*, and *positional variant*. The uninitiated will not be much enlightened by reading that a *phoneme* is "A single speech-sound [which, incidentally, it is not] or bundle of sound features which are relevant, and distinctive, to determine meaning."

The absence of pronunciations is not serious most of the time. The pronunciation of such words as *blacketeer*, *cortisone*, *neptunium*, even *biometeorology*, must be self-evident to anyone interested enough to buy the book. On the other hand, the pronunciation of words like *homeostasis*, *Nike*, *nisei*, and *sabra* may not be so obvious.

"Etymologies are rare in this book," writes Mr. Partridge, who continues: "Rightly so. A systematic etymology for every entry would probably have doubled the size of the book, without adding to its usefulness, however much it might, for a few of us, have increased the interest" (p. vi). When given, etymologies are a part of the definition; for example, *actin* is defined as "Part of the actinmyosin complex in muscles," *adrenergic* is shown to be composed from *adrenaline-energic*, *ordvac* from *ordance variable automatic computer*, and *quisling* is "After . . . Major Vidkun Quisling. . . ." Some readers will miss etymologies for words like *adermin*, *homeostasis*, *gyrene*, and *rocketsonde*, to name a few.

It is true that Miss Reifer's dictionary omits a number of recent additions to our vocabulary. This was inevitable. More important,

however, Miss Reifer has assembled within the covers of one book a significant and large vocabulary of the new words of the past few decades, a number of them not easily accessible elsewhere. Her book will be extremely useful to all students of new words.

A revision might correct minor misprints in the entries *lox* and *square*, straighten out the alphabetization on pp. 16, 32, and 229, and delete the entry *sandhi*, found in the 1909 *Webster's New International*.

University of Alabama

I. WILLIS RUSSELL

Robert A. Hall, Jr., *Hands Off Pidgin English!* (Sydney, Australia: Pacific Publications Pty. Ltd., 1955. 142 pp. \$2.00). AS a result of its condemnation by the U. N. Trusteeship Council in 1953, Pidgin English became a subject of considerable interest, particularly in Australia. Pidgin English is, like all other normal languages, the "collective creation of generations of speakers"; its proposed abolition was based largely upon ignorance of this fact and upon prejudice. Its very name has acquired such pejorative connotations that since writing *Hands Off Pidgin English!* Robert A. Hall, Jr., has actively proposed the adoption of the term *Neo-Melanesian* as the scholarly designation of what, in his *Melanesian Pidgin English: Grammar, Texts, Vocabulary* (Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1943) and elsewhere, as well as in the little volume under review, he has amply demonstrated to be a true language with a grammatical structure of its own. It is, moreover, a language which "fulfills an essential function in Melanesia by facilitating communication between natives who would otherwise have no language in common, since there are hundreds of different languages in the Territory," and which Hall is convinced can make a great contribution to the welfare of the Territory, "not only in everyday communication but also in education, medicine, government, and other fields" (from a letter sent by Hall to various learned journals advocating the change of name).

Here again is the crusading Robert Hall of *Leave Your Language Alone!* in contrast to Hall the linguist writing for other linguists, Hall the Romance philologist and historian of Italian literature. These two manifestations of the same man are, however, equally admirable, each in its own way. For those who, like Hall, are thoroughly grounded in linguistic science and can yet write clearly

and engagingly of its mysteries for the general reader are all too rare—which, as Raven McDavid has effectively pointed out, notably in a review published in *Studies in Linguistics*, XII (1954), 32, is why linguistic science is so little understood and so little regarded by the general public.

Hall's apologia is cogent and at times even eloquent, and his exposition is always clear and simple. Beginning with a discussion of pidgin languages and their origins, he proceeds to a presentation of the merits of Melanesian Pidgin English—a language “used more among Melanesians than it is between Melanesians and Europeans” which has come to be a true “linguistic cement” for the Territory, “not a language foisted by European invaders on helpless natives.” Moreover, it is, like all true languages, one in which “one can say anything one wants to in the cultural situation in which Pidgin is used.” Some of the objections raised against it are precisely the same objections which only a few centuries ago were raised against the use of all vernacular languages by those who believed that Latin was the sole appropriate medium for science and philosophy.

All of the fantastic strictures which lay linguists have leveled against Pidgin English (e. g., that it consists of “fifty English words and fifty Pidgin words” and that it has “no grammar”) along with the senseless vituperation directed at it as a “mongrel jargon,” a “monstrous perversion,” a “ludicrous lingo,” “barbarous gibberish,” etc., should be completely dissipated by the orderly analysis of the structure and vocabulary of Pidgin which comprises Part V of Hall's book. Here is fairly detailed linguistic exposition for the layman which is thoroughly sound, with technical terminology kept to a minimum; yet there is no hint that Hall is “writing down” to his readers.

In Part III the argument proper is resumed. Pointing out that the relatively simple organization and the Melanesian features of Pidgin make it “easier for Melanesian speakers to learn than the wholly alien way of thinking and speaking represented by English,” Hall believes that “with adequate materials based on a thorough analysis and comparison of Pidgin grammar with that of English, and with properly trained teachers, Pidgin could serve as an excellent point of departure for Melanesians to learn English”—that is, those Melanesians who for one reason or another wish to do so, for there is no good reason why the two languages should not continue to be used side by side as at present. As Hall says,

If we throw away such a valuable means of instruction as Pidgin, we can be sure that our enemies will not. Nothing would please the Communists more than to have us reject Pidgin and hand it over to them gratis as a vehicle for anti-Australian, anti-European propaganda. One is inclined to suspect that this very aim may be part of the attacks on the use of Pidgin which have come from leftist and Russian sources, in the United Nations and out. It would suit our enemies' book very well to get us to trip ourselves, jiu-jitsu fashion, over our own linguistic prejudices.

Nor is this particularly far-fetched: cf. the effective Communist use of the *demotike* for propaganda purposes in Greece in 1945.

There are two appendixes, containing respectively a bibliography (in which Hall's name very naturally looms large) and sample Pidgin texts in prose and verse, which substantiate Hall's opinion that Pidgin is "a most interesting and attractive little language," giving "something of the same pleasure that one gets in looking at or using a skillfully made miniature object."

University of Florida

THOMAS PYLES

Lee M. Hollander, tr. *The Saga of the Jónsvíkings*. Translated from the Old Icelandic with Introduction and Notes. Illustrated by Malcolm Thurgood (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1955. 116 pp.). THE indefatigable scholar and translator Lee M. Hollander has added another item to the long list of works translated from Old Icelandic verse and prose. This time he has turned the very spirited *Jónsvíkinga saga* into equally spirited American prose. Formerly it existed only, as he tells us, in a bowdlerized version of the nineteenth century.

Anno Domini 986 these Jónsvíkings, during a heavy drinking bout at a funeral in Denmark, shot their mouths off about an invasion of Norway, and that in such terms that next morning they felt they had better invade Norway or else.

Says Hollander: "This saga furnishes an instructive example of how historic fact is transmuted into legend," and he goes on to devote a good deal of space in the preface to illustrate this. Nevertheless, he has no comment on the central literary motif of the saga, summarized above, the story of the *heilstrengingar* or vows which the Jónsvíkingar made over their cups at the funeral, and that neither in the preface nor as a note on the respective chapter eighteen. All

this in spite of the fact that this is the best known passage on *heitstrengingar* in the Icelandic sagas, though the device was no less popular in French literature as the famous *gabs* of the Emperor's twelve peers in *Pelerinage Charlemagne* show. From this evidence in two literatures one would be bound to decide that this was a literary device, far removed from practical life, both in France and in Scandinavia. But when one comes upon the very same vow-making in the *beots* of the *Battle of Maldon*, a reliable historical poem about a battle fought by the Vikings in England 991, one realizes that this literary motif has its basis in actual practice. At any rate there is no reason to doubt the tradition that the invasion of Norway by the Jömsvíkings was triggered by similar vows.

As is usual in translations Hollander puts in a word of excuse about irregularities in treatment of names. There is not much to find fault with in that department, except his rather strange transliteration of Hjörungavágr as Hjörung Bay. According to his practice elsewhere it should be Hjorunga Bay; he transliterates Björn quite reasonably with Bjorn. His prefatory advice about pronunciation probably gives a better idea of his own pronunciation of Icelandic than its actual pronunciation Old or Modern. He advises to pronounce "ey" as long English "i" whereas if he were aiming at the Old Icelandic pronunciation it should be somewhat like the French pronunciation of "euille" in *feuille*, and if he were aiming at the Modern Icelandic pronunciation, which is certain and which he could have looked up in my book *Icelandic*, it should have been like long English "a."

But these are, of course, rather minor blemishes on an otherwise good book.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

Jóhann S. Hannesson, *Bibliography of the Eddas. A Supplement to Bibliography of the Eddas (Islandica XIII)* by Halldór Hermannsson. (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1955. 110 pp. *Islandica*, XXXVII). THIS is, as the title says, a supplement to a bibliography published in the same series by Halldór Hermannsson in 1920. Although that bibliography was to cover Eddica from the beginning (1665) up to that date, it was actually a somewhat smaller book than the present supplement, which covers only thirty-five years. This testifies to a comparative flood of books during these three decades,

a phenomenon one can observe in many other fields of writing, hence causing no special surprise here.

"An attempt has been made to include all editions, translations, important paraphrases and works of immediate importance for Eddic studies. . . . An exhaustive bibliography of works bearing on the Eddas is impossible: the related fields are too numerous and too large to be fully covered. . . . The fundamental rule . . . has been to omit all general works in these related fields (for example Jan de Vries's *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte* and Hermann Schneider's *Germanische Heldensage*) whereas articles and monographs on particular aspects of mythology, religion, heroic lore, etc., have been included when they seemed of sufficient direct value." Such is the avowed policy of the bibliographer.

Judging by this last rule, I wonder whether Gudmund Schütte's "Nibelungensagnet," *Edda* 1917 VIII, 213-68 should not have been included, though Hermannsson omitted it from his first bibliography. It contains Schütte's attempt to connect Sigurðr and the Gjúkungar with historical Merovings, quite plausible but mostly forgotten by scholars. The second edition of *Völuspá* by Sigurður Nordal (Reykjavík, Helgafell, 1952) has been overlooked.

The book is a welcome sign that the present Curator of the Icelandic Collection at Cornell is not minded to let Hermannsson's valuable bibliographies go un-supplemented.

The Johns Hopkins University

STEFAN EINARSSON

Frieda N. Politzer and Robert L. Politzer, *Romance Trends in 7th and 8th Century Latin Documents* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1953. 68 pp. Univ. of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, 21). THE purpose of this monograph is to provide a statistical analysis of graphemic substitutions in mediaeval Latin texts from Northern France and Northern and Central Italy. To this end the authors have devised an ingenious system of file cards, each of which contains, for every document, a count of the number of deviations from the classical norm, upon which are based a number of chronological (for France, with 43 documents, ranging from 625 to 717 A. D., totalling ca. 2300 lines) and dialectal (for Italy, with 205 documents, ranging from 720 to 773 A. D., totalling ca. 9000 lines, and covering the area

from the foot of the Alps to Toscanella, from fourteen different localities) statements concerning phonemic substitutions. The sound changes of principal interest to the authors are those commonly used to distinguish Western from Eastern Romanic, that is, the history of vowels under varying conditions of stress accent, of medial consonants, and of final *-s*. The resultant dialect boundary is generally assumed to lie along the line between La Spezia and Rimini, so that Northern Italian dialects go with French, Spanish and Portuguese, while Central and Southern Italian dialects go, more or less, with Rumanian.

The Politzers have used a strict method of phonemic and structural, rather than phonetic and atomizing, method of analysis and explanation, which is as it should be. Their principal results are the following: (1) The peculiarities of Northern French as compared with the other Romanic dialects, including tentatively the lenition of intervocalic stops, a) are caused chiefly by the intensification of the stress accent, which b) occurs in the seventh century, and c) is due to Germanic influence; (2) in Italian Romanic there are two currents of phonemic change, namely, a) an intensification of stress accent, strongest in the north, decreasing and spending itself gradually toward the south, b) the fall of final consonants, moving in the opposite direction; (3) all these phenomena together establish certain dialect boundaries, so that a) the meeting of movements 2a) and 2b) causes the major dialectal differentiation between Northern and Central Italian (or Western and Eastern Romanic), and also determines the position of Sardinian which is affected by neither current, but b) it must be noted that this boundary is not yet fixed in the eighth century, the Po river being an earlier dialectal divide between north and south (or east and west).

These findings, none of which is wholly new, are of two basic types, anchored in either a relative or an absolute chronology. Of these I accept the first, but I am skeptical of the second, as I am of the programmatic contention of the authors that "by examination of the documentary evidence . . . we can establish absolute chronology, and by the use of statistical counts we can investigate precisely those dimensions of space and time which remain otherwise closed to the scrutiny of the historical linguist" (50).

I rather believe that the Politzers themselves do not choose to be so rigidly positive about their absolute chronology, for they write that "further study will show that [dialectal divergences] appeared even earlier [than the seventh century] throughout the Romance

world" (49), and that "it is entirely reasonable to assume that the causes of the divergence of the Romance languages antedated the Eighth Century" (35).

The difficulty lies of course in the nature of the evidence. It is true that there is a definite connection between the documents and the spoken language, because the deviations from the written classical standard, which is, after all, desired by the later writer also, are conditioned by the speech of the writer. But it does not by any means follow from this that these deviations are *quantitatively* representative of speech, or that the appearance of a linguistic change in writing coincides in date absolutely with its appearance in speech. (For a detailed exposition of this, I am taking the liberty of referring to my article on "Spoken and Written Latin," *Language*, 26.1950, 458-466.) In this, then, I disagree fundamentally with the Politzers, who take the position that "the relative frequency of those deviations [in the documents] can still be considered as representative of the spoken language itself" (1). *Qualitatively* this may be true; that is to say, the occurrence of a deviation from the standard will more often than not testify to its existence in speech. But I should prefer to draw no conclusion from this on the exact time or the prevalence of this change in the language of the majority of speakers, who at the period treated in this book were mainly uneducated and illiterate. What the authors rightly contend with reference to documents originating from *one* scribe, namely, that "the conclusion [on a linguistic change] may be drawn not from the frequency of an orthographic variant but from its absence or presence as the case may be" (44), applies, I think, also to all scribes collectively, provided they are, as they must be if the description of linguistic changes is to be meaningful, speakers of the same dialect.

Where the authors say, then, that their statistical analysis has led them to conclude, for example, that "during the Seventh Century Northern French speech [N. B.] underwent an intensification of stress accent" (49), I should rephrase this in the sense that during the seventh century the spelling habits of Northern French scribes indicate that an intensification of stress accent had, in the course of a preceding period of undetermined length, progressed to such a degree that even scribes who, at that time, are learned men by definition, had fallen victims to a popular usage which they would have avoided had they known how to. This is especially true in the type of texts examined by the Politzers: they are all private or public legal

documents, and hence eminently unsuited for purposes of absolute dating of linguistic change.

Moreover, the order of Classical Latin—Late ('Vulgar') Latin (cf. p. 12), is permissible only with reference to written texts, that is, evidence of the same type. For even in classical times, during the Golden Age of Latin literature, it is certain that Ciceronian Latin is not representative of the various types of spoken language. Hence, an absolute chronology of linguistic change based on a sequence of (*written*) Classical Latin—Late ('Vulgar,' but *written*) Latin (these are the documents of our book)—(*spoken*) Romanic dialects, switches levels of linguistic usage radically. This is illicit because it ignores the time-lag which inevitably occurs, and especially in mediaeval Latin, between the establishment of a new form in speech and its delayed appearance, generally, through ignorance and default rather than intent, in writing.

But these criticisms concern a basic difference of opinion between the authors and the reviewer, affecting only a part of the book. As for the conception and the execution of the task the Politzers set themselves, one can only have praise. While the results, as I have mentioned, on the whole corroborate established theories favored by a majority of scholars and obtained by other methods, and reject the generally less popular views, such confirmation achieved by a different and more pertinent view and analysis of the evidence is useful and welcome. Indeed, problems of historical linguistics ought to be approached from several sides, through comparative linguistics, a series of structural analyses chronologically spaced, and social and cultural history. When the results of all these endeavors, if performed through reasonable methods by reasonable persons *sine ira et studio*, agree, then we can say that progress has been made.

University of Michigan

ERNST PULGRAM

Walter Naumann, *Grillparzer. Das dichterische Werk* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1956. xiii + 182 pp. Urban-Bücher, 17). PROFESSOR Naumann's study purports to show to "every one" how the essentials in Grillparzer's works ("Dichtungen") can be comprehended. The rewards of such an endeavor, the author continues in his brief initial remarks, are the love and the understanding of the reader and the "Umgang mit dem dichterischen Werk" resulting from them.

Naumann's monograph, most of which makes interesting and fascinating reading, will take its place in the line of studies that endeavor to fathom the personality of Franz Grillparzer and to discover the essence of his works. Future Grillparzer scholars cannot ignore it. Some of its conclusions will not remain unchallenged.

Ernst Bertram says in his *Nietzsche—Versuch einer Mythologie* (1918): "Sokrates und Christ, Homer und Shakespeare, Cäsar und Napoleon haben Umlaufzeiten ihres Gestirns, deren Länge der Lebensdauer des menschlichen Geschlechts gleichzukommen scheint. Ihr Mythos—das ist der zwingende Anruf, ihr Bild immer neu zu vollenden—stirbt nicht. Kein einzelner kann und wird jemals ihre Legende, den vollendeten Mythos ihres Wesens zu Ende dichten. Fragmente zu ihrer grossen säkularen Mythologie zu geben, ist alles, was dem einzelnen oder einer einzelnen Generation gegönnt ist." If we accept Naumann's contribution in this sense, i. e. as a "fragment in Grillparzer's secular mythology," it matters little that we cannot agree with some of the critic's conclusions, that some of his supporting "Belege" lead us to quite different inferences, that over-simplification is sometimes placed in the service of dialectics, that the critic's identification of the poet with some of his characters without concrete substantiation is "conjectural interpretation," not sound philology. "Derselbe Text erlaubt unzählige Auslegungen—es gibt keine 'richtige' Auslegung," says Nietzsche, the philologist. The book under review presents Naumann's Grillparzer and some of his works as he (Naumann) sees them.

"Vorbemerkung: Zeit- und lebensgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen" (pp. VII-XIII) gives, as excellently and succinctly as could possibly be done in six pages, a brief account of Grillparzer's life and historic background. The study consists of eight more or less well linked essays (which could easily have been published separately) presented in three chapters: "I. Zugang: A. Der Dichter und die Sprache; B. Selbstdarstellung im *Armen Spielmann*; C. *Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg*; II. Themen: D. Sein und Schein; E. Das Gericht; F. Die Zeit; III. Stellung: G. Goethe und Grillparzer; H. Grillparzer und das spanische Drama."—Here, in brief, are the essentials:

After citing Gundolf's harsh statement in regard to Grillparzer's language and tone, Naumann tries to show the difference between the nature of Goethe's lyric expression and Grillparzer's language which "begründet immer und erklärt. Ihr Ziel ist nicht Glück, sondern Wahrheit." (This essay will be discussed more fully below.)

In *Der arme Spielmann* Grillparzer judges himself as a person who is not equal to reality, who is little because reality (to him) is divine. But Naumann warns (with Hofmannsthal) against seeing in this "Selbst-Verkleinerung" a "Sich-Kleindünken."—The opposite of Faust runs through Grillparzer's work.

The main figure of Rudolf II in *Bruderzwist* reflects the totality of the poet's own personality. *Bruderzwist* is Grillparzer's greatest drama because he sees his own fate as a poet centrally interwoven with the irrepressible fate of his age. The deed is nothing conclusive, does not procure happiness for him because it (the deed) is not considered as belonging to the individual. Man is seen as a member of the "Gesamtheit."—Grillparzer's "Lebensgefühl" demands that he be responsible, that he call himself to account.—Political relationships are the most important for Grillparzer.

The theme of "Täuschung" and "Wahrheit," of "Schein" and "Sein" runs through the entire work of the poet. The irony of the blindness of the others exists side by side with the disillusionment of the one who stands in the midst of things. Deception and truth lie side by side, that is the last word of the dramatist Grillparzer.—Love is the most beautiful deception of life, but it is also reality; yet this reality is the last judge.—Participation in life is a self-assigned task; the symbol of this participation is love.—Grillparzer's "vollendetstes" drama is *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, much simpler than *Bruderzwist*, perfect in the simple assignment of the theme.

The presence of a judge is basic for Grillparzer's world of ideas ("Vorstellungswelt").—In *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, Grillparzer's most beautiful drama, a "historisches Märchenspiel," the task of man and the judgement that awaits him in this task are unmistakably recognizable.—The age ("die Zeit") is the ultimate basis of judgement for Grillparzer.—He evaluates in the area of reality and of the age, the political-historical area.

The opposition of the two aspects of time, namely perpetuity and the fleeting moment, is basic for Grillparzer's world.—The true home of his figures is in the timeless.—Happiness is peace of soul, "not being touched by the times." It appears to Naumann that the concern of Grillparzer's entire dramatic work is to come to terms ("fertig zu werden") with the ephemeral ("dem Vergänglichen") without the support of the assurance granted by the absolute judgement of the believed Christian religion.—Grillparzer changes to recognition ("Anerkennung") the judgement over the total figure of the hero, the

"fear" of the classical tragedy. His last judgement is justification. Accomplishment is emphasized, not failure. Standing the test is demonstrated rather than tragic guilt; or, at any rate, guilt is placed in a conciliatory light by the expressly stated judgement.—Events, once set in motion, overpower man; he is exposed to the times as soon as he has dealings with them.—The desire to undo that which has been done, to forget it, is, as it were, the elementary reaction of Grillparzer's "Lebensgefühl."

It is Goethe's goal to mold himself, which implies confidence in life. Goethe represents the urge of modern man to live, to *be*. Grillparzer distrusts life. He sees himself as a man with a mission and sacrifices his personal existence to his "Dichtertum."

The last of the eight sections deals with the influence of Calderon and Lope de Vega on Grillparzer and with the latter's ideas on fate and freedom of will.—Grillparzer comprehends and characterizes the figures of *Die Jüdin von Toledo* on an ethical basis. He is thus shown to be the heir of German classicism. He expands the area to which German classicism restricts itself by questioning, under Calderon's guidance, the freedom of will and, above all, by recognizing, like Lope, the demands of the community as the conscience of the individual. He represents the individual as part of a social unit.—

In the light of the author's avowed intention of encouraging his German public to read Grillparzer's works, the presentation of his views in the very first essay, "Der Dichter und die Sprache," is unfortunate. Naumann says himself that Gundolf, coming from Shakespeare and Goethe, cannot do justice to Grillparzer's language, a fact that has long been recognized. To "investigate" this matter, Naumann devotes page after page to a comparison of Goethe's lyric expression with Grillparzer's. To show what Grillparzer "lacks," the word "nicht" is used thirty times, "kein," six times. Other terms of negation are "niemals," "nirgends," "versagt," "weit . . ." and "vollkommen . . . entfernt," "bleibt . . . fremd," "steif und hölzern," "ohne," "unerfüllt," and "fehlt." The cultured German does not need to possess too much intelligence to come to the conclusion, even before he reaches the end of this first section, that *Goethe* is a very good poet who should be read, *not* Grillparzer.—Comparison can be used effectively in the service of elucidation, of course. But if Goethe's "Geisteshaltung" is fundamentally different from Grillparzer's (as Naumann says), why compare their lyric treatment

of nature? There is no basis for comparison. If Grillparzer comes closer to the scheme of medieval description of nature, why not compare him, favorably and in positive terms, with his predecessors? Should a second edition of the book become necessary, a thorough revamping of the first section, or possibly its omission, would improve an otherwise unusually provocative monograph.

Except for a few awkward expressions, caused in part by the influence of the English language, Naumann's German style is good. Typographical errors are at a minimum. The inexpensive paper edition in the "wissenschaftliche Urban Taschenbuchreihe" makes the little volume a handy book.

University of North Carolina

F. E. COENEN

Claude David, *Stefan George. Son Oeuvre Poétique* (Paris/Lyon: IAC, 1952. 409 pp. Bibliothèque de la Société des Etudes Germaniques, 9). ALTHOUGH Professor David's title might lead the reader to expect a study of the life and works of Stefan George, his main concern is to show George's development as a poet. The poems themselves accordingly receive the main emphasis, and this fact makes Professor David's book an excellent supplement to the more personal and biographical accounts of Salin and Boehringer. The various collections are considered in chronological order, but in his discussion of each collection Professor David is careful to bring out thematic and ideological connections with poems of other periods. Each collection is also discussed in the light of the evolution of George's aesthetic and ethical doctrines as expressed in *Die Blätter für die Kunst*, and in relation to the *Zeitgeist* whenever contemporary events have had a particular bearing on George's poetic creativity.

To bring his reader up to date on George scholarship Professor David begins his study with an analysis of the George-myth as it was developed during George's lifetime and after his death by his disciples and followers. He is then ready to present his own image of George as he reveals himself to the objective critic. Beginning with George's earliest works Professor David shows by a careful reading of the poems, how George first chose his own way among the many complex influences to which he was exposed as a young poet, and how he gradually developed and perfected his unique poetic style. One

major epoch in George's life as a poet is taken up in each chapter. Theory and doctrine are first presented as expressed in *Die Blätter für die Kunst*. The second section of each chapter then formulates succinctly the content of the poems of that collection. In the last section Professor David interprets and evaluates the most significant poems, taking into full account varying critical points of view expressed by others, and comparing and contrasting the poems themselves with the other poetic works of George and with the work of other poets in Germany and abroad. In tracing this complex evolution of George the author is particularly successful in bringing out the underlying threads of unity which interconnect the various collections and which are particularly elusive in the collections prior to *Der Teppich des Lebens*.

A select bibliography lists all works of George (even showing the number of copies printed in the earlier limited editions), all translations done by the poet, and the most significant books and articles about him and his poetic creativity. Following the bibliography the reader will find a most helpful table which lists by page number and title all individual George poems discussed or alluded to in text or notes and also indicates in the case of each whether it has been translated into French and by whom. Bold-face type indicates the most important references in the index, and, for the further convenience of the reader the symbol "n" is used to designate references to footnotes. The topical sub-headings in the *table des matières* have been reprinted in the appropriate place in the margins of the various chapters so that the reader can with maximum ease find specific materials on particular topics.

George scholars who have been irritated by the veneration with which the poet's disciples and his biographer Friedrich Wolters have surrounded him will welcome this critical and objective study which explodes the George-myth and presents an image in many ways quite at variance with that of the mythical George, who seems in contrast both less interestingly complex as a personality and less diversified as a poet. A single possible objection to this beautifully organized and critically penetrating study, which so effectively brings out the true contours of George's complex personality and makes us feel his greatness as a poet, is the fact that the analyses of individual poems are often too brief to be considered, properly speaking, critical analyses. In such a comprehensive study, brevity is of course inevitable. David's comments are most often so very good, however, that one cannot help

wishing that he had expanded them further. This criticism is, however, a very negligible one and should in no way be thought of as detracting from the excellence of this beautifully presented and critically penetrating study.

The Johns Hopkins University

WILLIAM H. McCLAIN

W-
aa
ti-

"
far
tio
It
lib

E
as
ser
lo
Ea
se
ca

M
in
ap
th
b
p
ci
a



1450
PAGES

Treasury of World Literature

Dagobert D. Runes, Editor

"... generously endowed with unfamiliar gems . . . edited with exceptional taste and wide erudition. . . . It deserves a place in every well-rounded library." —*Saturday Review Syndicate*

EVERY period from prehistory to 20th century contemporary writers, as well as every literary genre is represented — poetry, novel, drama, philosophy, belles lettres, and some Eastern forms that do not lend themselves to ready classification by Western categories.

Many of the selections are to be found in print *nowhere else today*. Some appear here in English translation for the first time. Each selection is prefaced by a condensed biographical sketch, placing the author in world literature, citing his major works, and including a brief critical appraisal.

A Magnificent Gift

Special De Luxe Gold Imprinted
Library Edition . . . \$15.

Student's Edition \$10.

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY
Publishers

15 E. 40th St., Desk 138
New York 16, N. Y.

Expedite shipment by prepayment

THE HARMONIOUS VISION

by

Don Cameron Allen

One of the central poetic topics that engaged the imagination of John Milton was that of the vision given to man when he had put his own inner music in harmony with that of God. In *THE HARMONIOUS VISION* this theme becomes an important means of explicating some of Milton's poetry and of understanding his artistic intent.

As Allen leads the reader through Milton's poetry, he shows the twin development of Milton as a poet, and of the idea of the "harmonious vision" in the poetry itself.

In the Fall, the harmonious vision is lost, but it can be won again. Towards its recapture, Milton, true son of Eve, expended the full powers of his poetic life.

The book comprises six essays, written in a scholarly yet engaging style. In this new reading of the great poet, Don Cameron Allen has produced a book which the publishers believe will be of utmost importance to Miltonists, and all serious students of poetry.

146 pages

Index

\$3.00

The Johns Hopkins Press
Baltimore 18, Maryland

SOMMETS
LITTÉRAIRES
FRANÇAIS

BY FRANCOIS DENOEU

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER

Modern Language Notes: regularly \$6.00 } **BOTH**
ELH: regularly \$4.00 } **for**
\$8.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD - BALTIMORE 18 - MARYLAND